

A
R E J O Y N D E R
T O
Mr. *DANIEL WILLIAMS*
H I S
R E P L Y

To the First Part of
Neomianism Unmaskt.

WHEREIN
His Defence is Examined, and his Arguments Answered; whereby he endeavours to prove the Gospel to be a New Law with Sanction: And the contrary is proved.

By *ISAAC CHAUNCEY, M.A.*

L O N D O N,
Printed for *H. Barnard*, at the *Bible* in the
Poultry. MDCXCIII.

Oct 21 1877

RECEIVED

1877, Oct. 21

Exh. of dupl.

I I I I I

To the effect of

RECEIVED

WARRANT

The above is a warrant for the arrest of the person named in the accompanying return, and the return is hereby approved.

BY THE COURT

J. W. C. W.

County of ... State of ...

A R E J O Y N D E R T O

Mr. *Daniel Williams* his REPLY.

Reverend Sir,

YOU say you are misrepresented, in my saying, You hold the Vacating or Abrogating the Old Law.

A. This is no false Charge or Misrepresentation, for if the Sanction be changed, as you expressly say, both in the former Book and in this, the Law is vacated, it ceaseth to be *Norma Judicii*, and what Passage you refer to in p. 198. of your former Book, relieves you not. P. 198. where you say, The holiest Action of the holiest Saint needs forgiveness: For upon your Hypothesis, there is general Pardon purchased conditionally, which Faith and sincere Holiness entitleth us to. The old Law itself is laid aside, as that which will never trouble the Believer; Christ hath satisfied that for him, but it is the new Law which the Believer must be tried by; which is the Gospel Law, and hath another Sanction to the preceptive part of the Law which the Covenant of Works had prescribed. P. 6. This new Law, you say, fixeth new Terms, viz. True Repentance and Faith unfeigned, to be the Terms of Pardon; which Terms, you say, the Covenant of Works admitteth not, so that the Terms or Conditions being changed, the Sanction is changed: What remains then but a new Law, the righteousness of which must be our justifying Righteousness, for there's no Justification by any Law without fulfilling it, by performance of that very Righteousness by our selves, or another, which that Law requires. And tho' you say, we are bound to the Duties of the Moral Law, yet you say, the use of Faith and Holiness, in respect of the Benefits, is not from their conformity to the Precept; [so that Conformity to the Precept of the old Law hath nothing to do as Righteousness in the new Law] but their Conformity to the Rule of the Promise, which can be no other than the Rule of the new Law. Hence it is manifest, That with you this new Law is distinct, both in Precept and Sanction; therefore it's out a doors. Lastly, none can deny, But that how good soever the Precept of a Law is, if the sanction be vacated or changed, so that it ceaseth to be *Norma Judicii*, it ceaseth to be a Law; and where a Law ceaseth to be *Norma Judicii*, there's no trial to be made thereby of Men's Actions, no Judicial Proceedings thereby, nor Justification or Condemnation by it; whatever we

are, in respect of another Law, our Righteousness must be judged of and tried by the Law in Force ; and this is your plain Judgment. See p. 131. you say, " If Men have nothing to do for Salvation, then Christ hath no Rule to judge them who lived under the Gospel. So that Men under the Gospel are judged by a Rule of doing, which is your Rule of the Promise. And again, *ibid.* " Consider the description of the last Day, and you'll find God Saves and Damns with respect to Mens Neglects and Compliance with the Gospel. You say, it's true, the Sanction of the Law of Works is removed, p. 135. Your granting, That we deserve Wrath, in respect of the Covenant of Works, and that the Law is a Rule of Duty, &c. is nothing, for 'tis not meer satisfying that Law will save us, or the Righteousness thereof, but a Compliance with, and obedience to a new Law. You say, *The Law cannot hinder our Relief by Christ, from the Sentence* : Christ stands between us and that Law, that we may be saved by another. Forgiveness, you say, is not by single Obedience [we say, it is by Christ's, which is single Obedience] but it is by our imperfect Obedience that must follow. You say also in this Reply, p. 23. " Were not the Gospel to be a Rule of Judgment (*norma Judicii*), I cannot see how that can be a Judgment Day, it must be only an Execution Day ; for by the Law of Adam no Believer could be acquitted ; that Law must be altered by the Law-giver, to admit Satisfaction (which is a strange Expression, as if Christ could not satisfy Adam's Law, without altering it, the Law must be vacated if Christ satisfied and fulfilled it, *cujus contrarium verum est*) " and it is by the Gospel " only he hath enacted the way how this Satisfaction shall be applied ; And that way enacted is your new Law that comes in the room and stead of the old Law, vacated. Therefore, I beseech you, consider your own Reputation more than to say, I misrepresent you, in saying, You hold that which your Words shew, your Scheme must contain, and you know in your Conscience is your Principle.

Again, You charge me for misrepresenting you, whereas you say ; " Christ's Sufferings are the Foundation of our Pardon ; that our Sins are forgiven for Christ's Sufferings. By my saying, Your *Fundamentally* is only a remote causality *Causa sine qua non*, by something else besides them.

R. You know, whatever you say, to palliate it, that you mean Christ's Righteousness is our legal Righteousness ; but our Faith and Obedience, our evangelical Righteousness, which you own under the Name of a subordinate Righteousness, and is not the Inference of *causa sine qua non*, p. 20. Very natural, when you say, For the Sufferings of Christ our Sins are forgiven, and explain it thus ; Without them Sin cannot be forgiven. How can a *Causa sine qua non* be more plainly expressed ; as thus, The going out of my Door is the *Causa sine qua non*, of my going into *Cheapside*. How so ? without going out of my House (which is in another Street,) I cannot go into *Cheapside*.

You say, " It's strange that anyone should infer, That you deny the Righteousness of Christ, to be the sole meritorious or material Cause of our Pardon ; which in Judicial Acts are the same.

R. All this may be, and your contrary Sense to us still the same.

R. It's one thing to be a meritorious cause of Pardon, and another thing to be our very sole justifying Righteousness. I can say Christ's Righteousness is the sole meritorious Cause of Sanctification, for which we are sanctified, as well as for which we are forgiven ; and yet we are sanctified by the Spirit ; and so for which we are adopted. Hence you will say, Christ's Righteousness is the meritorious Cause for which we are pardoned and justified by the Gospel-law, the Condition whereof you make Meekness (what is required of Sinners is only a meekness to receive the Effects) this Meekness is the Evangelical Righteousness ; this is the Condition we shall be tried by at the last Day, and this is the Law Condition upon which we receive the effects of Christ's Righteousness ; not the righteousness itself neither ; And is not this Meekness a material Cause in the Gospel Law of our receiving these Effects ? Why then hath it not the same Place in respect of the new Law as Christ's Righteousness hath, in

respect of the old Law, so that there must be at least two Righteousnesses requisite to our compleat Justification, one Righteousness to answer the Old Law, and another to answer the New? And indeed here Christ's Righteousness is made by, you most properly the subordinate Righteousness, because it is *in ordine ad*, it's only in order to another Righteousness. In the most favourable Sense, you make the Righteousness of Christ to merit *ex condigno*, and Evangelical to merit *ex congruo*, for all Law Meetness is meriting, either in respect of the remunerative or minatory part of the Law. All that you say over and over helps not, nor covers you from those that know your Dialect; nor your saying, That Christ is the foundation of your Plea: I may found a Plea or Argument upon a thing that is not my Plea, or at least my chief Plea, and how do you found it? Why, for the sake of Christ, accepted against excluding bars, you say; whereby you have Permission now to come in with your Evangelical Righteousness. You speak here just as in your other Book, to this Point, and I understand you still as I did then, and you know you mean as I have represented your Meaning, but you would not have the People understand what you mean; and therefore you throw in an abundance of Expressions, thereby to hide your Opinion, but instead thereof they lay it open. What is more plain than this? *Repl. p. 3.*

"The Terms of the Gospel by the Promise do make us *capable* of being justified "and saved for the Merits of Christ. Now here's your true sense of being forgiven for the Merits of Christ, *i. e.* when we are made capable by the *righteous Meetness* of another Law, we shall be absolved in the old Law sense, by the righteousness of Christ. And mark that all along, its forgiveness only comes from Christ's Merits; there's no positive righteousness of Christ, in active Obedience, is reckoned to us; this positive righteousness whereby we stand just in the Eye of the Law, in your sense lies wholly in Conformity to the Rule of that Promise, which is the new Law righteousness: And you use the word Merits still, in the way of procuration, not satisfaction. You say we are justified only by Christ's Merits, as the sole procuring cause or righteousness, for which we are justified [to which you should add, that the Reader might take your full sense] by the righteousness of the Gospel Law.

That which you call the fifth Misrepresentation, and is your fourth, I am not convinced of, but that my Inferences are truly drawn, according to your natural sense and meaning of what your Expressions and what your Principles must bear, 1. That you make the great end and use of Christ's Righteousness to secure us from the old Law, Mr. B. calls it out legal Righteousness: and therefore our Justification is not an immediate effect of that Righteousness, but of our evangelical Righteousness. 2. That he merited only that we might Merit, *i. e.* that he procured our Justification by evangelical Righteousness; you will not call it Merit; call it what you will, *its a Law of Meetness*; and a Law meetness I think, gives a claim and challenge of Pardon; and if we should pray in your Dialect, we should pray thus, *Lord, I am meet to be pardoned for the Righteousness of Christ.* 3. That you make Faith and Repentance the meritorious cause of Pardon and Glory by the new Law, and that's true, for all conformity to; and compliance with the conditional Preceptive part of a Law gives right, a legal right to Remuneration, and the benefit becomes a reward of Debt; and if so, the meetness is a Merit, *ex Paeo*. All these, *tho* you say, you disown, yet in what you declare, you say but what you said before, and from whence the same Consequences will follow, *viz.* That God requires a meetness in a Sinner for Justification, and that this meetness is a federal condition.

1. You say, Christ satisfied Justice and merited Pardon and Glory, *i. e.* he satisfied Justice in respect of the old Law, and merited Pardon and Glory, to be bestowed as Rewards of Obedience to another Law: And that

2. The Sinner thus partaking of them, is as Fruits of his Death; and this is all done for his sake.

3. You

3. You say, God in Christ hath declared a way and order how he will dispense his Benefits; this way is by another Law, in which he acts in a way of distribution of Justice, upon performance of Law conditions, p. 4. And therefore you say, Gospel conditions have no other use to our Interest in these Benefits, than a compliance with this stated Rule of the distribution of Pardon and Glory, p. 4. *Adam's* obedience had no other use, than a compliance with the stated Rule of Gods distribution of Life promised, and Pardon and Glory is no other than Life promised. So that you make your Law to be every whit the same *in specie*, with a Covenant or Law of Works; the condition works out the reward of Debt; but this is all the difference, that Man fell under the first Covenant of Works by Creation, but under the second by Redemption; he was redeemed from the Curse of the old Law that he might be justified by another Law Covenant; and this is your plain meaning, as you say: And these things you do but say over and over again in this Book, as in the former. And what doth this conditional Grant of these Effects import, but that we should have Justification, Adoption, &c. upon the performance of obedience to another Law? Which is as much as to say, Christ purchased another Law, and Obedience to it must let us into Pardon by Christ. This purchasing conditional Grants and Propositions, is a new sort of Divinity, suiting the highest degree of Arminian Doctrine, and will strike at the nature of absolute Election, which gives ground of suspecting you also in that Point, as well as what you say of the favourability of the none Elect; tho' I acknowledge you often assert absolute Election; but how well that Principle will comport with indefinite Redemption, upon a conditional Grant, let the rational judge. You go on again, and say, as from *Chap. 10. Pag. 84.* of your first Book. "When Sinners are pardoned, the whole meritorious cause of that Pardon, is that atonement; and what is required of Sinners, is only a meetness to receive the Effects. You need quote no more, to give us an account of what you mean in these things; if the Reader desires to be further confirmed in the truth of my representation of your Principles, let him read *pag. 4, 5.* of your Reply.

You quote Passages in p. 30, 31. of my Book (for the first Head) from whence you say, "I endeavour to render you one, that thinks Faith or other Graces did merit the pardon of our Sins; which you say, is contrary to your declared Judgment."

Rep. I grant you deny Merit; and I profess, Sir, I would not willingly wrong you by any false Imputation; but this I tell you, it signifies not much to deny a Name to a thing whose Nature requires that Name if it be named aright; a federal condition performed, doth bring a Man into the claim of the benefits promised as Debt, your own word gives the performance of the condition the *meritum ex congruo*, merit of meetness; and you making this meetness federal, I know not how it can be avoided but it will be Merit.

You quote Proofs, that you do not call this meetness Merit, but you call Christ's Righteousness the Merit, as this; there is a *Righteousness for which a Man is justified, and that is only Christ's*: But you'll say, there is a Righteousness of meetness upon which a Man is justified for Christ's Righteousness, *i. e.* the qualifying condition of the Person whom this Mercy is promised to, he must have a Conformity to the Rule of the Promise; and its by this we are justified for the righteousness of Christ. To what purpose is it to deny Repentance and Faith, to be meriting Righteousness; when according to your Scheme, it can be denied in no other sense than in respect of the Covenant of Works? The satisfaction of the breach whereof, you acknowledge to lie in the Righteousness of Christ conditionally, *i. e.* for all that shall conform to the Rule of the Promise, which Rule is the preceptive part of the new Law; which Conformity you call, with others, subordinate Righteousness, intituling us to another Righteousness; it's this Righteousness, you say, we shall be judged by at the last day. Now Sir, I say, that Righteousness which Believers shall be acquitted by in the day of Judgment, that is the Righteousness that they were justified by, and the Righteousness of that Law which they shall be

be judged by. Let us but a little consider how near this subordinate Righteousness comes to the Papist's Notion of Merit, and if their Merit be not as small a thing as your meetness and new Law conditions of Justification by Christ's Righteousness.

Hear what S. de Clara our Countryman tells us.

Meritum est Actio libera acceptata ad aliquod premium.

Meritum de congruo est Actio libera ex congruitate quâdam acceptata ad premium.

Meritum de condigno, est Actio libera ab Homine in gratiâ elicitâ qui ex Justitiâ acceptatur ad premium.

Merit is a free Action, accepted to some Reward.

Merit of meetness is a free Action, which by reason of some congruity or fineness is accepted to a Reward.

Merit of worthiness is a free Action of a Man performed in Grace, which from Justice is accepted to a Reward.

Now the Question is, 1. Whether that personal Qualification, which you require of meetness for Justification by Christ's Righteousness, be not exactly the Papists Merit of Congruity? Upon which is their first Justification. 2. And the sincere imperfect persevering Obedience be not their *Meritum ex condigno*, or of Worthiness? Which is their second Justification.

See the first Justific. the Council of Trent, Decr. 5.

The beginning of Justification of the Adult, proceedeth from preventing Grace which inviteth to dispose themselves, consenting and co-operating with it freely, &c. The manner of this Preparation is, to believe willingly the divine Revelations and Promises, and knowing ones self to be a Sinner, to turn from the fear of God's Justice to his Mercy, to hope for Pardon, and so begin to love him, hate Sin, purpose to be baptized, &c. Decr. 7. Justification followeth this Preparation. Decr. 8. When a Man is justified by Faith, and gratis, it ought to be understood, because Faith is the beginning, and the things that precede Justification, are not meritorious of Grace, And in another P. they condemn those that say, A Man may be justified without Grace, by the strength of Human Nature, and the Doctrine of the Law. What is it that you say of your Doctrine of Meetness, which they will not say in behalf of your congruity? And Scotus tells us, That an act is not meritorious precisely, because it comes from Grace, but because it is accepted of God, as worthy of eternal Life, as you say it's the Promise made to that meetness gives the right.

Concerning *meritum de congruo*, merit of meetness, Bellarmine disputes, lib. 1. c. 21. and concerning that *de condigno*, lib. 5. de justificatione, the merit of Meetness he ascribes to the Works of him that is to be justified, a *paribus justificandi*, i. e. that meetness for Justification by Repentance and Faith, previous to Justification and capacitating for it, or disposing to it. The other, viz. Merit of Condignity, is ascribed *operibus justificati*, to the evangelical sincere Obedience of one justified by the first Justification, whereby he merits the second Justification: and though you will not own the Name Merit, yet in your Scheme, your first Justification by Meetness, or upon Meetness, and the second upon persevering imperfect Obedience, is the same Justifications that Bellarmine means, for the Jesuite saith thus, The perfection of our Righteousness and Justification is not from Faith but from Works, for Faith doth but begin Justification, and after it hath assumed to itself Hope and Charity, it doth perfect it. Bellar. de Justif. l. 1. c. 20. And again he saith, de merit. "Good Works merit without all doubt, yet not by any "intrinsic Vertue and Worth in them, but by vertue of God's Promise, and is not this as much as you say again and again, It is the Promise that gives Right to Benefits upon our Conformity to the Rule of the Promise, p. 104. And Calvin, inst. 1. 3. s. 12. "They are forced to deny the intrinsic worthiness of Works, and grant the Rightness."

"ousness of Works is always imperfect, while we live here, and wants forgiveness
 "whereby our Failure in Works may be made up. He makes it appear, That a Promise made with a Condition of a Work, brings this to pass, that he who performs the Work is said to have merited the thing promised, *ex pado*, and may challenge his Reward as Debt in Law.

It signifies not much whether you suppose the first Grace to be saving, or meer moral Endowment; the Council of Trent condemns them that say, A Man may be *justified without Grace, by the strength of Human Nature, and the doctrine of the Law*: If you make the first Grace a qualifying meetness for Justification, in order thereto, it is the Papists Doctrine.

Thus you see your sheltering your self under the absoluteness of the first Grace, will not do; And, 1. Doth God give the first Grace absolutely? then all other Graces conditionally, for the first Grace comes from the same federal Condition that all doth. 2. The giving the first Grace is the giving eternal Life begun. 3. Either the first Grace is through Christ or not; but 'tis strange to say, That Christ gives inherent Grace to one that's not united to him (but as his designed Head, as you phrase it) and to one in a State of Condemnation: And should make a change in his Nature before a change of State. 4. Then Sanctification, (if Faith be any part of it) must be before Justification, contrary to the best Protestants, and what you have said.

Your 8th Exception is, That I say 'tis the Doctrine of Imputation that you banter; and you tell us what you say of it in your Book, where, when I come to the Places you quote here, you will see my Remarks on your Sayings: And so as to the ninth and tenth, it will be spoken to in its proper place: And as to the eleventh and twelfth, I am of the same Mind I was, I shall not spend Time in Vindication; and I leave the considerate Reader, who understands himself, whether I do not give a very fair account of your Opinion, whereof, by the Quotations of yours, out of your former Book, you give sufficient Confirmation.

As to the stating Questions in difference between us, you do it not fair: The first you say is, *Preface 2. l. 1.* Whether the elect are required to believe, that they may be justified? This, you say, I deny.

R. You should have quoted the Place: I say there are Commands in the Ministry of the Gospel unto Sinners, to believe and obey the Gospel, that they may partake of Justification by Christ's Righteousness, but not to perform it as a moral condition, that thereby they may be qualified for Justification, or made meet for it as you say.

2. "You say it is not whether the Gospel be such a Law, that the Acts of Obedience to it stand in the place of Works, so as for them we are saved; but whether the Gospel assure Salvation for Christ's Merits, to such as obey it, and their active exclusion of Salvation to such as disobey it?

This you say you affirm, and I deny; I'll tell you what I say: The Gospel can't be a Law commanding Obedience as a federal condition of the Promise, but upon performance of it the Promise must be a reward of Debt; and if the Promise be Justification for the Merits of Christ, then its due as Debt upon the said Obedience; and tho' you say, Justification for the Righteousness of Christ, yet that Justification must be the reward of Obedience required in that Law.

3. "It is not whether we are justified by our Faith as an Act of ours, as if they [you mean Repentance too] as Works or Qualifications, were a Jot of that Righteousness for which, or by which, we are justified: This I deny.

Rep. Who says you say it; that Righteousness of Christ, to which you annex your *for*, or *by*? but *for* and *by* this Righteousness we come to be justified by our Faith and Repentance, the Duties required in another Law, which you tells us is the Gospel Rule [*i. e.* your Law] "That a Man must be a penitent Believer whom God will justify, for the Righteousness of Christ: This you say you affirm and I deny, and that with good reason, that our Faith and Repentance must be previous, qualifying Duties to

our Justification. So that a Sinner must repent and believe in a state of Condemnation, before he is justified; and its no more than this, that for Christ's Righteousness which is our legal Righteousness, we shall be justified by or according to our Evangelical.

4. Your next Particular is the same; and I say as before, God doth not justify us as a judicial Act for any Duty or Act, tho' wrought by the Spirit.

5. You say, " It's not whether we are justified upon believing before any Works, which follow the first Act of saving Faith.

R. No, for the Papists own their first Justification to be so; but you say,

" If Faith should be ineffectual to Acts of sincere Holiness, and to prevent Apostacy and utter Ungodliness, would we not be subject to condemnation by Gospel Rule ?

" This you say you affirm, and I deny.

R. Let us examin this then, and see what you affirm.

1. That there's a possibility true justifying Faith may be ineffectual, and so there may be a falling away.

2. That till Faith hath brought forth sincere persevering Obedience we are not fully and certainly justified; we must be justified by the second Justification, before we be secure.

3. That Apostacy and utter Ungodliness is prevented by a Gospel Rule of Condemnation that we are made subject to; its a fine way to prevent Apostacy to lay us under a Rule of Condemnation, you mean a Sentence: For my part I can't see these things hang together, nor know what you mean by a Rule of Condemnation, but in the sense of the Law working Wrath, which is quite contrary to the nature of a Gospel.

6. " You say and we say, That Holiness and good Works are necessary to Salvation; on; but that I deny they are indispensable means of obtaining the Possession of Salvation through Christ.

R. If I say they are necessary, it is enough, tho' I may not own them to be indispensable means in your sense, as a Law condition is an indispensable means of the Reward; and if they be indispensable means, the Thief upon the Cross could not have been saved, and hundreds more, that I doubt not, but God saves in the like manner.

7. It is not whether Justification, Adoption and Glorification be Acts of Gods free Grace, which I affirm.

R. But you said otherwise, That forgiving, adopting and glorifying, and the conveyance of every promised Benefit, given on Gods Terms, are judicial Acts of God as a Rector, *i. e.* As you after say, That Grace is so dispensed, by way of judicial rectoral Distribution of Rewards, &c. *Pref. of the 1st Book.*

" But the Question is, you say, Whether it pleased God to leave himself at liberty to justify the Unbeliever, while such, and glorify the Unbeliever and Wicked, and also to damn the penitent godly Believer; this Mr. C. affirms, and I deny.

R. You should have shewed the place where I said it, that your Charge might have fastned by a Demonstration. I marvel you blush not at such things as these.

1. Where have I that Expression, of Gods leaving himself at liberty? Its one of your Terms of Art, not mine.

2. That he justifies the Ungodly, is what the Spirit of God saith; and therefore I may.

3. But I say in justifying him, he sanctifieth him; and whatever a Sinner is, he is justified as such, not as made holy and sanctified, unless you'll confound Justification and Sanctification as the Papists and Quakers do.

4. But when did I say, That God doth glorify an Unbeliever, and a wicked Man; or damn the penitent and godly Believer? Or that in the Covenant of Grace he hath made any such Exception, that he may or will do so? I suppose that you must mean by leaving himself at liberty.

" This, you say, is these Mens free Grace, while they deny the Gospel Rule or Law. These Taunts and Falshoods are well enough, it seems, in your Mouth; its suitable to the rest of the Privy Prattle in this Preface.

8. " You say the Question is not, Whether God hath not as to us absolutely promised and covenanted with Christ, that the Elect shall believe, and all Men believing be pardoned, and so persevere in Faith and Holiness to eternal Life; which " I affirm, *Pref. p. 5.*

R. Here then you allow that there is an absolute Covenant of Grace (for whatever distinction you would make between the Covenant of Redemption and the Covenant of Grace, there's no Man of sense can deny, that the Covenant of Redemption is a Covenant of Grace) and if God hath absolutely promised to, and covenanted with Christ, that the Elect shall believe and be pardoned, this must stand absolute to the end of the World. But by your favour, tho' I am for the absoluteness of the Covenant of Grace, yet it was not absolute but conditional to Christ; that Faith and Pardon and Perseverance, as promised to Christ for the Elect were conditional, and the condition was, that he should make himself an Offering for Sin, bear it, and make full satisfaction to the Law by his Righteousness Active and Passive, and make Intercession for Transgressors, and therefore tho' you affirm here, yet I deny.

" But the Question is (you say) whether there is a Covenant which requires our true believing consent to the Terms of it, to the condition of Pardon and Glory, and supposeth this true consent in the actual bestowing these Benefits? This Mr. C denies, and I affirm.

Ref. 1. I deny that there is any more Covenants of Grace than one, and say, That the Covenant between the Father and the Son, was that original Contract which was displayed and made manifest in the Gospel of the old and new Testament, and in whatever is required in this Display is absolutely promised. For if there be two Covenants wherein the same things are promised, and to the same Persons, the first absolute and the second conditional, the one must certainly be vacated by the other. For if I promise to a Person, or to another for him, to give him a House freely, and afterward make a covenant Bargain with him, that he must pay me 20*l.* or 20*s. per annum*, the first Covenant is vacated; or if I am bound to stand to my first Promise, the second Agreement falls to the Ground. 2. Likewise observe what you affirm, That God hath made Terms as a Condition, *i. e.* federal of Pardon and Glory. So that here is brought in a Covenant of Works, to intervene betwixt the absolute Covenant, and bestowing the Benefits, absolutely at first promised. Now Men may see plainly what you mean when you talk so much of Pardon for and by Jesus Christ; this Pardon is one of the Benefits bestowed in your new Law judicially, by way of remuneration to the performance of the Terms of Duty required.

9. " It is not whether Faith be the only Grace by which we receive and rest on Christ for Justification, and that it is Christ received by Faith doth justify, which is the sense of the Protestants, when they say we are justified by Faith alone; this I affirm.

R. Yes you do in your sense, *i. e.* That Christ justifies here, as much as is needful as to legal Righteousness; but there is another Righteousness, *viz.* Evangelical, that puts in for a snack, *viz.* that of the new Law. And you do much misrepresent the Protestants, for they say, Christ's Righteousness is all our Righteousness, of one kind and another that we are justified by, a Righteousness without us, and not by any within us, any Act or qualification whatever. But the Papists say with you, the Council of Trent doth anathematize " Those that say a Man is justified without the Merit of " Christ, by which Christ did merit for us, or is formally just by that, *Anath. 10.* And " they curse also any one that saith, that he is justified only by the Imputation of the " Righteousness of Christ, or only by Remission of Sins, without Inherent Grace,

Anath. 11.

But

But let's have the Query then ; It is, you say, " Whether he that can truly believe " to Justification, must be in part a convinced, penitent, humbled Sinner ; and this " you affirm, and say I deny.

R. You should have told the Place and my Words. Its possible I may deny it in your sense, and I will prove how that you must deny it in my sense, *i. e.* that legal Convictions and Humiliations are no federal conditions of Faith ; for you say, That the first Grace is absolutely given ; and if so, there's no federal conditions of it. Why do you not bring in hearing the Word, as a federal condition of Faith, for it comes by Hearing ? Why do you not bring in a Mans having his Senses and Understanding, and many more things ?

And now you talk of Humblings, let me mind you what you say, Page 15. " You tell " us of the Sum of the Popish Principles our Divines oppose. 1. They think that by " Attrition (or a selfish legal fear of Punishment) Men do, *ex congruo* (or meetness) " merit Charity and Faith, which be the beginning of Sanctification ; and that this " begun Sanctification is all our first Justification.

1. What do you say less than they, setting aside the word Merit, and they say as to that *de congruo* its scarcely so ? Say some are against *Meritum de congruo*, as being any Merit but only a disposition and meetness of the Subject, such as you would have, and we may put their Attrition to your Humblings, as a meetness for Faith. See what the Council of Trent saith, *Can. 8.* When *Paul* saith, " a Man is justified by Faith and " *gratis*, it is to be understood because Faith is the beginning, and the things that precede Justification are not meritorious of Grace : See now how you abuse the Papists. Nay I'll tell you more, for I would give the Devil his due ; you abuse the Papists in charging them for making this begun Sanctification all their Justification. The words of the 7th Canon of the Council of *Trent* are, " That Justification followeth Preparation, " which is not only remission of Sins, but Sanctification : And therefore they make not only Sanctification begun to be our first Justification. And in the 10th *Anathema*, they curse them that say, " A Man is justified without the Righteousness by which Christ " did merit for us. Now I think you ought to ask the Papists forgiveness for slander- ing of them.

Rhemists on *Rom. 2.* 3. they grant, That the beginning of our Justification, which they call the first, is merely of Grace ; neither can we do acceptable Works before we be justified, but in the second Justification, which is, the encrease of former Justice a Man may merit by good Works. So again they say, Works done of Nature before or without Faith, can't merit ; but Works done by God's Grace, may and are joyned with it, as Causes of Salvation ; and in these Points the Protestants oppose them. I could fill a Volume with it if need were, but its enough to say, you are mistaken in telling us what the Protestants oppose them in.

" You say also that I say, That Pardon is rather the condition of Faith, nay Pardon " is the cause of Faith.

R. I say rather, for if a federal condition must lye between giving and receiving, giving is the causal condition of receiving, and not receiving of giving.

2. The Object must be before the Act of the Organ, Pardon is the Object applied by Faith ; Application before there is an Object, is *conraditio in adjecto*.

3. The Promise of Pardon is the Ground and Reason of our believing, therein is the Grace brought, therein doth the Truth and faithfulness of God appear ; and the Apostle saith, Faith comes by hearing this Word of Promise, *i. e.* is wrought by it, *Rom. 10.* And he opposeth the Works of the Law, and the hearing of Faith in Justification *Gal. 3. 2, 5.* And what is that acceptance but of Faith, which the Apostle speaks of, *1 Tim. 1. 15* ? And what doth it accept, but that faithful Gospel saying there mentioned, *That Christ came into the World to save Sinners, and the chiefest* ? Its the Grace of God working in this Promise, that hath wrought Faith in the hearts of thousands

4. We say with all soundest Protestants, That Justification in Nature is before Sanctification and the Cause of it, and therefore of Faith, because Faith as a Grace wrought, is a part of Sanctification. Its enough for you, to hold up that you call Error, and give it Name, and so let it go.

10. " It is not whether Sanctification taken strictly do follow Justification ; this I affirm.

R. If you affirm this, you should not make so strange of my saying, Pardon is the condition of believing. What you hide under strictly I concern not my self ; Sanctification is Sanctification, and if Justification goes before it, you allow it to be *conditio ordinis* at least. Therefore I conclude, Pardon is rather a condition, yea I say not merely of Order, but such a condition as is an influential Cause. But go on, stating your difference.

" But whether effectual Vocation make a real habitual change in the Soul, and that this Vocation is in order of Nature before Justification : This Mr. C. and the Letter, and I affirm, with the Assembly.

R. As to the Letter, I must tell your Answer to it is short and ungenteel ; and as he did *Bellarmino*, who said *Bellarmino* thou lyest ; when you say, it was rather to serve a turn than to argue ; it spake Truth weakly, and other things erroneously and ignorantly, &c. It justifies a necessity of dealing a little more roughly with Men of your Country and Kidney. But to our Point in hand ; it need not be enquired, whether you take effectual Vocation in the active or passive Sense, seeing you say its such as makes a real habitual change in the Soul : And seeing it makes such a change, it must be a change of Sanctification, and this, you say, is before Justification ; how can that be, when you had said before, that Justification is before Sanctification strictly taken ? What kind of Sanctification, I pray, is effectual Calling ? Is it not so in a strict sense, when you say its a real habitual change in the Soul ? Is this not turning from Darkness to Light, raising us together with Christ or being born again ? But all this must be done before the Relative change ; a Man must be free from the reigning Power of Sin, and alive from the Dead without Jesus Christ our Lord. See what the Assembly saith in the larger Catech. Q. 67.

" That effectual calling is the Work of Gods Almighty Power and Grace, whereby out of his free and especial Love to his Elect, and from nothing in them moving him thereto, he doth in his accepted time, invite and draw them to Jesus Christ, &c. and they are hereby made able and willing freely to answer his Call, and to accept and embrace the Grace offered and conveyed therein, i. e. then they are effectually called, when they have embraced the pardoning Grace of God offered and conveyed ; which shews the previousness of that Grace-working the effectual Calling consummated in believing and embracing the Gospel offered ; the Gospel Grace in the Promise, is always that which works first upon the Sinner, moves his Heart, and draws it forth in believing.

" 11. It is not whether our sincere Faith and Love, &c. are imperfect, and so can be no meriting Righteousness ; which I affirm.

R. You affirm they are imperfect, and so do I ; but not therefore that they can be no meriting Righteousness ; for the Merit of Righteousness doth not depend upon the perfection of the Duty or Service in it self, but its perfection in relation to the Law that requireth it ; if the Duty required be never so weak, little, and lame, if I have such a degree as the Law requires, its perfect as to that Law : The Law requires a poor Man to pay a Shilling to a Tax, its as good obedience as another Mans that's required to pay twenty. Many Instances might be given, the Papists say, Merit lies not in the value of the Action, but in Gods Acceptation. The Council of Trent saith, Our Works are meritorious of eternal Life. *Quia a patre acceptantur per Christum*, yea, saith S. de Clara, *Actus meus dicitur meritorium quia elicitus seu imperatus a gratia ex passione divina acceptatur ad premium. Deum ab eterno ordinavit hujusmodi actus esse dignos vitæ eternæ quando*

quando ellicuntur a gratia habituali ; non igitur tota ratio meriti a gratia ipsa. So Scotus, Alius non est meritorius precise quia perveniens ex gratia, sed quia acceptatur a Deo tanq; dignus vita eterna. But where's the Question then ?

“ Whether Faith and Love, &c. are disobedient even in a Gospel account, and so “ incapable of being Conditions of any of its promised saving Benefits ?

R. In the sense of the Papists they be not, but be accepted of God for this end, to be federal conditions of a Law Covenant ; they are perfect in that kind and relation, and merit the Benefit ; but we say, tho' any of our Gifts of Grace or Duties are accepted in Christ, yet they are not accepted to any Merit or Worthiness of any other Grace ; federal conditions and worthiness of all Grace and Blessings bestowed on us, are only in Christ ; and hence Faith and Charity and other Gifts of Grace, tho' they have a conditional connexion one to another, yet they are all of Promise, and can't be federal conditions of any promised saving Benefits.

“ Mr. C. saith, I am against the Articles of the Church of England and the Assembly ; “ I am sure he'll never prove it, and I profess the contrary ; but I am sure he's against “ all the Confessions of Faith that we own as Orthodox.

R. How your Principles agree with the said Articles and Confessions, upon Impartial Examination, let others judg ; 'tis not your saying, your profess the contrary, will satisfy the World, when *res ipsa loquitur* ; especially when you have the Confidence to suggest such a false thing of me in the same Breath, That you are sure I am against all the Confessions of Faith that are orthodox (but indeed you say, which we call orthodox) that we, I suppose, are, you and your Schematists ; and then what they account orthodox, I shall not trouble myself. You go on and say, “ In the Strength of Christ “ you'll sustain the utmost Persecution at the Hands of these angry Men ; and while God “ enableth me, they shall not overturn the Gospel by their unscriptural Abuse of the “ blessed Names of the Righteousness of Christ, and free Grace and the Gospel way of “ Application.

R. Enduring Persecution is no Infallible Argument that a Man's Principles are good ; if it were, Papists and Quakers then have more to say for the justification of their Principles than ever you had, or are like to have ; and let the wise judge, how near akin yours is to theirs : And whereas you insinuate, as if you had suffered Persecution from the angry Men (as you call them) who have conscientiously contended earnestly for the Faith. Impartial Men will (if they do weigh and consider duly what you have done and said in these Matters) determine which side hath been the Persecutors, if Reproaches and false Imputations be Persecution, and God will judge one Day whether you be a Champion (as you would be accounted) for Christ or against him ; the Day will reveal it ; its not enough to brave it out before the World, a Judgment at Man's Day will not serve our Turns ; he that judgeth you and I is the Lord, and therefore consider what you do, while you call so much upon the Name of God and Christ, to countenance your confident undertakings in this Affair.

You say, “ there's a Mystery in it that one Explication of a Text should be pretended “ for a Reason against my whole Book, and so countenance all Dr. Cr. Errors, which “ they profess they dislike.

Rep. There's no Mystery in it, that any faithful Minister or People should not only be highly jealous of ; but exceedingly blame such a Book, and the Author which shall rob them of so high an Article of their Religion as the true Nature of the Doctrine of Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, and for the maintaining himself therein, must wrest so eminent a Portion of Scripture out of their Hands as to its genuine and plain meaning, upon which thousands of the most eminent Saints in all Ages have lived, and do live ; no, be you confident, they will not lose that sense of that Portion of Scripture (Phil. 3.) which you oppose ; they'll tug hard for it first, and it will stand in the Hearts and Prayers of God's Children maugre all Opposition. And whereas you say, you hear *Augustine* is of your Mind, I'll tell you what an Author of none of the least Name tells

tells me, concerning *Austin's* Opinion : Thus *Augustinus breviter ostendit ab Apostolo, &c.* *Austin* briefly shews from the *Apostle* Phil. 3. 9. that whatsoever is of his own Righteousness is excluded there ; and that *Paul* speaks not of the Law of Circumcision or Uncircumcision, but of the Precepts in which 'tis said, Thou shalt not cover. *Lydaker. de diffor. legis & Evangel.*

You proceed to vindicate yourself against the Charge of not being against the Articles and Confession, and pitch upon the Doctrine of Imputation for an instance wherein you know you differ from them ; and your stating your Judgment in that Point sufficiently evinceth, though you do it after that perverse manner which is usual with you, to make your Principles look sound.

You say, " You will state that Case, viz. of Imputation. 1. It is not whether Christ was a publick Person, as a Mediator in his Undertakings, and so transacted all for Sinners, that they might be pardoned and saved by his undertaken Satisfaction and Merit : This I affirm ; but whether we are so represented in Christ, as that we are in Law Sense ; they that undertook to atone and merit ; this I deny.

R. What do you mean by a publick Person, as a Mediator ? Did he stand in such a Capacity as to represent, undertake for, and stand in stead of the Elect ? were they federally in him as his Seed ? for so the Assembly say they were. See *Confess. c. 8. sect. 1.* " He was made the Head and Saviour of his Church, the Heir of all things : Unto whom God did from all eternity give a People to be his Seed. So *Larg. Cat.* The Covenant of Grace was made with Christ, the second Adam, and in him with all the elect, as his Seed : But you say he only transacted for Sinners as a Mediator ; but do you mean such a Mediator as is a Surety ; if so, the Persons for whom he is a Surety are federally in him, for he takes the Debts upon him, stands in their room and stead, and they federally in him accounted, and to all Intents and Purposes he is entertained, as comprehending all their Debts in him. A Man may be a Mediator, and treat with both Parties at Variance ; but not take the whole cause upon, so as to treat and engage, and make Payment in the Room of the offending Parties. But let us hear what your Question is.

" Whether we are so represented in Christ, that we were, in Law Sense, those that undertook to atone or merit ? this I deny.

R. I will appeal to all Men of Sense in the World, whether they can tell by your stating this Question, whether you own or deny Christ to be a publick Person, representing the Elect. He is a publick Person as Mediator, and represents so as no body ever said any person did represent another : viz. That we are, in Law Sense, they that undertook to atone and merit. A person comes to be bound, as surety, to a Creditor for an hundred Debtors in *Ludgate* ; he becomes Debtor, and is accepted in the room of all and every one, they all pay, and are discharged in him : Doth the Law reckon that all these Men were Sureties, or that they atoned or merited ? but that in the Surety's Atonement and Merit, they being all represented by him, their persons are accepted, and their Debts paid. Doth any Body look upon the Debtor to be the Surety because the Surety stands bound ? Or because the Surety pays or undertook to atone and merit ? I would fain know whether this be not perverse perplexing a Question instead of stating of it ?

3. You go on, stating thus : " Nor whether Christ was a Surety for us, in a Bond of his own, to pay our Debt to the full (or more) that we might in a due Time and way be released ? This I affirm.

Reply. If Christ came under Obligation to pay our Debt absolutely, he represented not as if he obtained our release but conditionally, upon future Terms to be performed by us or some others ; for then his Suretiship was not for us, but to purchase Conditions for us.

" But whether we were joyn't Parties in one and the same Bond with him, and so we were actually acquitted when he made satisfaction ? therefore God could enjoyn

"no Terms of Application to us for Justification and Glory, nor suspend the same upon those Terms. This I deny.

R. What mean you by joynt Parties in one and the same Bond? do you mean the Bond of Debt to the Law, by reason of the Obligation of Doing and Suffering? there we stood bound as Principles, and not being able to discharge, Christ became bound as Surety; we were never bound as Sureties nor Christ as the Principle. But if you mean that both were bound to pay the same debt, we do affirm it.

2. What do you mean by an actual Acquittance? Is it not meet that he that hath his Debt satisfied, should have an actual Acquittance, or their Surety for them? there's no Man pays a Debt, his own or anothers, but he will have an Acquittance, according to the Terms of Payment, if they were such as you suppose, viz. to purchase a Discharge upon other Terms. But you say, If Christ were actually acquitted, and the elect in him, God would not come upon new Terms with the Sinner for Justification and Glory; this is as much as to say, Christ paid a Fine for Sinners, that they might be brought to lower Terms with the Justice of God by a milder Law. How false are you, when you tell us, Your meaning is, That Christ's Righteousness is our only justifying Righteousness? whereas here you own, That it obtained not our full Discharge, but only the bringing us under new Terms; upon which Justification and Glory are suspended; is not the Performance then of those purchased Terms, our immediate justifying Righteousness?

3. That which you affirm in this first part is pretty unintelligible, but according to my Understanding it amounts to no more than that Christ dyed *pro bono nostro* only, which is consistent with all the Socinian Notions of Imputation. But as that which you say you deny, I want it to be unriddled; viz. "That Christ was joynt Covenant Party with all the elect, in Adam's Covenant, so that they are legally esteemed to make Satisfaction, and yield Obedience in his doing thereof.

R. You seem here to suggest as if some did hold, That Christ was under Adam's Covenant, so as the rest of his Posterity was, and consequently fell in him, as they did. Or do you mean that all the Elect in Christ satisfied the Law, as all Adam's Posterity brake it in him? and this I suppose you deny. Now, as unto this Point, if I have hit your Meaning, I will tell you what a great Divine saith in answer to a Socinian: "The first Adam was by God's Institution a publick Person (having shewed that God's Pleasure is the first Rule of Righteousness) hence in him sinning the World sinned. "The second Adam is not only by God's Institution a publick person, but also an infinite Person, because God: This publick Person doing and suffering was as much as if the World of the Elect had suffered. If the first Adam, a finite Person, was by God's Institution in that Act of Disobedience, a World of Men, why should it seem strange that the second Adam, being an infinite Person, should be by God's Institution in the course of his Obedience, as the World of the Elect? He being infinite, there needed no more than God's Pleasure to make him the World of Men, yea ten thousand Worlds. That which is infinite knoweth no bounds, but God's Will. The kind of his Obedience was legal, the same in Nature and Measure which we, by the first Covenant stood bound unto. This his Obedience to the Law was more acceptable to God than the Disobedience of Adam, was detestable; yea more acceptable than the Obedience of Adam (understanding both as publick Persons) had he continued in the first Covenant. *Nott. against Pinob. p. 6.*

4. That which you affirm of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness here, is no more than what you say every where, importing no more than as to its Effects; but your Expression is strange, in saying Christ's Righteousness is reputed by God, as that which now pleads for our Impurity, &c. which seems to import that it doth not actually plead, but that God is willing to reckon it a kind of Plea: So that the Imputation you here intend of Christ's Righteousness is to Christ himself, and not to the Sinner: But you tell us what you deny,

You

You say its this, " That it is imputed as our formal Righteousness, and so we may truly plead, that we our selves, as Elect, did legally by Proxy as our Christ, satisfie and merit all, and without the Interposel of the Gospel Rule, we have a legal Title to glory by *Adam's* Covenant : This I deny, as that which excludes Forgiveness, makes Christs Sufferings needless, denies any proper satisfaction, and destroys Christianity.

Rep. Here 1. You seem to deny Christ's imputed Righteousness to be our formal Righteousness, for Christ's Righteousness we reckon to be, as it were, the Matter of our Justification, and being imputed by an Act of Grace, becomes our formal as well as material Righteousness; for if it become not by Imputation our formal Righteousness, its not our perfect Righteousness; for Matter and Form are the essential Causes of the Effect.

2. That we in Christ, satisfied the Justice of God, I know no sound Protestant but will affirm, and that legally. Mr. B. saith over and over, Christ's Righteousness was our legal Righteousness, but you will deny, that we legally satisfied in Christ : May not a Debtor plead that he legally paid the Debt in his Surety, tho' not with his own Money ?

3. You cast Reproach upon the Suretiship and federal Headship of Jesus Christ, by calling him a Proxy and Attorney, as our Surety and Representative. A Proxy is Vicarious, an inferior Person that's employed to do Business in the Name and by the Authority of a Superior, so that he is his Vicar or Substitute. But is a Father, that pays a Sons Debts, and purchaseth an Estate for him out of his meer Love, Pity and Compassion, the Sons Proxy ? Or if a Man purchase an Estate for his Heirs for ever, is he a Proxy to the Children yet unborn ? And yet their Estate is bought and paid for in him, the original Right and Title lies in him the Purchaser. Or a rich Man, who undertakes for the Debts of an hundred poor Prisoners in *Ludgate* (suppose the King, or another great Person) out of meer Pity and Commiseration, is he their Proxy ? Is he not their Benefactor and Patron ? I wonder how you can speak these things without suspecting your own Spirit, when you do so manifestly cast Dirt upon Jesus Christ ; may not I justly say you banter the Doctrin of Imputation ?

3. But you say Christ can't satisfie and merit for us, without the Interposel of a Gospel Rule ; the meaning whereof is, That Christ hath not legally satisfied for us till we have done something in conformity to the said Rule, that may give validity to the satisfaction of Christ, and make it pleadable as such ; so that Christ hath neither satisfied nor merited, till we make up the Complement whereby it becomes legal.

4. What mean you by a legal Right to Glory by *Adam's* Covenant ? If you mean by Christs satisfaction and obedience to *Adam's* Covenant, we have our legal Right to Glory, we say it ; for Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believes, and through his Righteousness we have a Right to Glory by *Adam's* Covenant ; Christ's Righteousness is our legal Righteousness, as it respects the Perfection and Justice of God in that Covenant ; and its our Evangelical Righteousness, as its in the behalf of, and bestowed upon undone Sinners.

But you say this Doctrin excludes Forgiveness ; Why ? Because it brings in Forgiveness merely upon Christ's Righteousness alone ; But how makes it Christ's Sufferings needless ? when it lays all upon the Righteousness of Christ, imputed as the Matter and Form of our Justification ? Or how doth it deny proper satisfaction, when it makes Christ's Righteousness all the satisfaction ? And your Doctrin makes it but an improper and remote satisfaction, yea and imperfect. And lastly, you say, it destroys Christianity : This is so gross a Charge, as that it is to be exploded with Detestation ; if the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, as our legal and evangelical Right and Title to Life and Salvation, destroys Christianity, we may burn our Bibles. But you go on.

5 You affirm, " That all sinned and dyed in *Adam*, and in *Christ* are all made alive, " owning *Christ's* influence, both real and publick, as before explained.

R. All this is *nihil ad Rhombum*, you own not hereby the Imputation of *Adams* Sin to his Posterity; but that Sin and Death are only Effects of *Adam's* first Sin, *i. e.* influential; you own not that all Men were legally condemned in *Adam*, as a publick federal Person, standing in their stead: In the same manner you always speak of the Righteousness of *Christ*, as influential to our Forgiveness; and that the imputation of it is only bestowing the Effects. " But whether we were in *Christ* before Faith, as we " were federally in *Adam*, before we were born; which his federal Headship did suppose the being thus in *Christ* before Faith; I deny.

R. You here grant our federal being in *Adam*; and that *Adam's* federal Headship supposed it, and therefore we were federally and federally in *Adam* before we were born. Why speak you it not positively, whether it was so or no? That we were federally and federally in *Adam*, and that our Sin and Death was in him; there we lost original Righteousness, and thence the Imputation of his very first Sin to all his Posterity, by virtue of our federal standing in him, and by reason of our being federally in him, the corruption of the whole Nature was in him, and naturally descended to us? If it be so, why are not the Elect as to Righteousness and Life in the same manner in the second *Adam*, federally and federally before they believe, *i. e.* before they are born again, in him federally, as to Righteousness, and federally as to the new Nature, *Christ* being their Righteousness and Sanctification, whereas the Apostle runs the Parallel so fully and plainly as he doth, *Rom. 5*?

But all this is but shuffling the Cards to make People believe your Principles are what they are not; most of whom cannot tell what you hold, when you have darkened and confounded the Question, by your manner of stating it: You say, I object against you the denying of the Doctrine of Imputation; why do you not deny the Charge, but only distinguish so upon it as to confirm it? If your Principles are Truth why do you not speak them out (but fill us with your cloudy Expressions and Distinctions, which you charge us for) why speak you not plainly, That you deny the Suretieship of *Christ*, as you know you do? That you deny *Christ* to be a publick Person, in the Sense as the soundest Protestants have always held him to be; which last you do here in effect positively do, That we were neither federally nor federally in *Christ* before Believing: Which, if so, I am sure you must deny the whole Doctrine of Imputation, and what you pretend to can be no more than what the Socinians do. And how can you say you are not against the Confession, and I am, when the Assembly saith, *Confess. c. 8. sect. 1.* That *Christ* is ordained of God the Head and Saviour of his Church, &c. unto whom he did from all eternity give a People to be his Seed, and to be by him in Time redeemed, called Justified, Sanctified, Glorified. In the same manner they speak in the *Larg. Catech. Q. 30, 31, 32.* as above rehearsed. And in the *short. Q. 18.* man's sinfulness consists in the guilt of *Adam's* first Sin.

by imputation. Norton, The scope of Mr. Forbes is to prove the Imputation of *Christ's* Passive Obedience, and that only in his Death, to be the Matter of our Justification, &c. We consent to Mr. Forbes, as to the Argument taken from the Comparison, but dissent from him as concerning the Restrictions, the Reason of the Comparison being founded upon the Conditions of the Persons and Divine Institution, it holds betwixt such Acts as the first and second *Adam* acted as publick Persons: *Adam* therefore being in that Act of Disobedience, only a publick Person, hence that Act only is imputed unto his Seed: But *Christ* being in all his Acts of Obedience a publick Person, hence therefore all the Acts of *Christ's* Obedience are imputed to his Seed. As upon supposition, *Adam's* continuing in Obedience (because he had then continued a publick Person) all the Acts of his Obedience, even to the finishing of perfect Righteousness, had been imputed to his Seed, according to the nature of the Covenant of Works, unto their attaining of Justification by the Law. The Union between *Adam* and his Posterity

See Pinchin the Socinian, and Mr. Norton's answer, p. 253. Dialo, I grant that all Mankind are one with *Adam*, by a natural Union, as proceeding from the same Root; but I fear Mr. Forbes doth stretch out our natural Union with *Adam* to a personal; to the end that he might make *Adam's* personal Action to be ours

was not personal, nor only natural, but myſtical: It was a Conjunction of the Perſon of *Adam*, and all contained in his Loyns, in one Spiritual Body, by the Inſtitution of God, whereby he was as their Head, they as his Members, to ſtand or fall with him ſtanding or falling.

Mr. *Norton* ſums up *Pinchin's* Errors under three Heads. 1. In his denying the Imputation of the Sin, of the Elect unto Chriſt, and his ſuffering the Punishment due thereunto, contrary to 2 *Cor.* 3. 21. *Gal.* 3. 12. *Iſa.* 53. 5, 6. thereby leaving the Elect to periſh in their Sin. 2. Denying that Chriſt, as God-Man Mediator, obeyed the Law, and therewith that he obeyed it for us, as our Surety, contrary to *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. *Matt.* 2. 17, 18. *Heb.* 10. 7. compared with *Pſal.* 40. 8. 7. 8. *Rom.* 3. 31. thereby rendering Chriſt both an unfaithful and inſufficient Saviour, and ſpoiling the Elect of Salvation. 3. Denying the Imputation of Chriſt's Obedience unto Juſtification, contrary to *Rom.* 5. 19. *Phil.* 3. 11. thereby leaving all that are ungodly under an impoſſibility of being juſtified. 2. Destroying the very being of a Sinner's Righteouſneſs, by taking away the Obedience of Chriſt unto the Law, and Imputation, which are the Matter and Form *i. e.* the eſſential Cauſes of Juſtification. 3. Placing a Sinner's Righteouſneſs in a fictitious Atonement or Pardon of Sin, ſuch as in effect doth man fully not only deny itſelf to be the effect of it, but denyeth, yea deſtroyeth the very being of the Mediator, by Obedience of Chriſt to the Law for us: The firſt holdeth us in all our Sins, and continueth the full Wrath of God abiding upon us. The ſecond takes away your Saviour. The third takes away our Righteouſneſs and Juſtification: What need the Enemy of Jeſus, Grace and Souls add more? And I am ſure this Socinian ſpeaks as plauſibly of theſe Doctrines, which he oſpoſeth, as you do; yea and more.

In the 39th. Page of your Book, you pretend to ſome Answers, to what I affirm in ſome things: As that I deny the Covenant of Redemption to be a diſtinct Covenant from the Covenant of Grace. I own it, and make good my denial elſewhere, therefore will not *adum agere*.

You blame me, p. 40. for ſaying, p. 29. That Pardon is not promiſed to Faith and Repentance, as things diſtinct from the Promiſe, but Pardon is promiſed together with Faith and Repentance to the Sinner. And herein you ſay, "I confound a Promiſe of Grace, and promiſes made to Grace, and affirm the Goſpel Covenant is but one Promiſe."

Repl. 1. I do affirm, That the Promiſe of the Goſpel in its Original Grant and Comprehensive Nature is but one, as the Promiſe of the Covenant of Works was but one, viz. Life. So in the Covenant of Grace 'tis Life, the Spirit of God is expreſs in it, 1 *Joh.* 2. 25. *αὐτὴν ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, This is the Promiſe which he hath promiſed us, even eternal Life.* And 1 *Joh.* 5. 11. *αὐτὴν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀναγγελία, This is the Record (or Teſtimony) that he hath given us, Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son.* Now Eternal Life contains all Juſtification, Sanctification, Adoption and Glory. 2. I affirm that in this Promiſe is Juſtification, Faith and Repentance promiſed. 3. That in this Promiſe Juſtification, Faith and Repentance are inſeparably conjoynd. 4. That in and under this Promiſe are multitudes of Gifts beſtowed in a way of connexion one to another, and have their particular Promiſes pointing diſtinctly to them; but theſe Gifts are no federal Conditions one of another. 5. I ſay, If you ſpeak of theſe Gifts of Righteouſneſs and Life, as in a way of conditionality, 'tis Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the proper federal condition of Life, and Pardon is rather the Condition of Faith and Repentance than they of Pardon. I ſay ſo again, 1. If Giving be the Condition of Receiving, 'tis true; but Giving is the Condition of Receiving, for Faith is but the Sinner's receiving Pardon: Is not the giving of Pardon then rather the Condition of Faith, which is the receiving of it, than Faith of Pardon? *Luke* 1. 77. *Acts* 10. 43. So for Repentance: The Cauſe is rather the Condition of the Effect than the Effect of the Cauſe; but Forgiveneſs received by Faith is the Cauſe of all true Evangelical Repentance. See this ſaving Repentance and Remiſſion, both given by one Hand of Promiſe, *Acts* 5. 31. preached together by Commiſſion, *Luke* 24. 47. How ſtrange ſoever you make of this Divinity, 'tis built on the Rock Chriſt Jeſus, and you cannot ſhake it, nor all the Devils in Hell. You ſay, I wretchedly miſtake the Nature of the firſt Promiſe, as if it excluded all Terms of our Intereſt in the Bleſſing of it.

Rep. I know not what the first Promise is, if it be not a Blessing; and if the first Promise be absolute to us (as you say the first Grace is) then it excludeth all Terms to be wrought by us, to interest us in the Blessings of it, unless you intend that a natural Man is to perform these Terms in his natural State; and then the first Grace is not absolute: And as for the first Promise, concerning the Seed of the Woman, it was absolute, and saved our first Parents as such, for it was all their Gospel as I know of, and therefore they by it had Remission, Faith and Repentance, without bringing the two last into a federal Condition: For if God had intended to bring them in as such, 'tis most likely he would then have mentioned them as such, *Adam* just coming out of a Covenant with federal Conditions.

In answer to what I say of a Legal Grant, you say 'tis out of my Element. Be it so, others may not judge it so, though you do: Mr. Antinomian saith, a Grant may be legal two ways, either by free Gift, from a Person's good Will and Pleasure; and so God's giving us, both Grace and Glory is legal, because it gives us an undoubted, unexceptionable Right. And a legal Grant is a Law Covenant Grant, when the Gift is bestowed upon the performance of federal Conditions, as Grace and Glory is bestowed in and for Christ and his Righteousness; both these Grants we have first in Election, choosing us in Christ; and in the eternal Compact between the Father and the Son. You say what I speak of, *Tit.* 1. 2. will appear not to be eternal, but before many Ages, and not to exclude Gospel Conditions. If Christ be our great Gospel federal Condition, I say it doth not; for God's Purpose and Grace was given us in Christ, and were to be bestowed in and through him. But who told you that *οὐκ ἔστιν αἰώνιον*, was but before many Ages, 'tis sure before the Times or Ages of the World; and what can be supposed to be so but Eternity, when Christ rejoiced in the Sons of Men, *Prov.* 4. And I think I have a good Interpreter on my side: *Beza* saith, on *Tit.* 1. 2. In his Judgment the Word *αἰώνιον* cannot be referred to the first Promise, made to *Adam*, *Gen.* 3. much less to that of *Abraham*: But, saith he, *Ante tempora seculorum*; before the Ages of the World, doth denote all series of Time or Ages, *i. e.* before this World was, according to *John* 17. 2, &c. In this Sense runs the Assembly's Notes, *Poole's* Anot. continued.

What I say of the Gospel's being no Law with Sanction, I shall not trouble the Reader with here, but handle it in its proper Place; and therefore pass by all you say, p. 43, 44 and 45.

As for what you speak about that Position of Mr. B. I leave the Learned to judge, whether you have saved it: I shall hardly set that and other things in a greater Light, unless you provoke me thereto, as you insinuate by further Endeavours to set other Men in the Light or Dark, to as great Reproach as you can cast upon them.

You say I make Mr. R. B. to speak orthodoxly, by saying, p. 22. When once a Transgressor is sentenced by a Law, he falls into the Hands of Perogative, and the Prince may do with him what he pleaseth (*i. e.* either execute him or pardon him) God also might have put Repentance into the Condition of the Law of Works, and said, If thou dost not eat, or repent of thy eating, thou shalt have thy Reward: You should have added, the Reason of my so saying; it was upon your saying, The Law of Works admitted no Repentance: I tell you, If God had intended Salvation by a Law of Works, wherein Repentance should have been a Condition, he might have put it in at first; but God never intended to accept Repentance as a federal Condition of any Covenant, nor our imperfect Condition: And so I say again, with a *non obstante* all that you have or can say against it; And I must stand to that Rule which Mr. *Norton* takes from *Cham. de defensu*, tom. 2. l. 5. c. 12.

" This great Principle is all-a-long to be kept in Mind, and occasionally to be applied, as in Answer to this Question.

Q. " What is the supreme and first Cause why Justice requireth, That Sin should be rewarded with Punishment due thereunto, according to the Law ?

A. "The free Constitution of God, the principal and whole Reason of this Mystery depends upon the good Pleasure of God; for who can deny that God could have saved Man in another way? But he would save him thus, and no otherwise than thus. This serves not only as a Sword to cut, but as a leading Truth to loose the Knots of Carnal Reason. The good Pleasure of God is the first Rule of Righteousness, the Cause of all Causes, the Reason of all Reasons: And, in one Word, all Reasons in one Reason.

And how doth this make the following Saying orthodox? viz. "Being that Christ the Mediator, and Faith in Christ are only means of the Restauration of Men to God by Holiness and Love, therefore it must be said from the Nature of the thing, Faith, Holiness and the Love of God, are more necessary to Salvation than either Faith in Christ or the Sacrifice of Christ himself.

Now if I had said that this Position were God's Constitution, viz. that Holiness and Love to God wrought in us, should be more necessary Means of Salvation than Faith in Christ, or the Sacrifice of Christ, you had said something: Or that it were the Constitution of God, That Christ in all things should not have the Preheminence, whether *in genere causarum, mediorum vel finium*, Col. 1. 18, 19, 20. Therefore to say Holiness in Grace or Glory is more necessary than Christ Mediator, is to magnifie the Creature above Christ, himself. But because you say you would not have spoken the Words yourself, but endeavour to explain them as charitably as you can, I do not think it convenient to give you any further trouble about them; but I must remark, That it is not so fair in you to charge all upon me as my Sense, which is spoken by an Interlocutor in a Dialogue.

AN

A N E N Q U I R Y,

Whether the Gospel be a New Law :

S I R,

YOU begin thus. *Reader, Though I did not once call the Gospel a Law in all my Book, only in my Preface called it a Law of Faith; yet because the whole of Mr. C's Book runs on this, I shall insist most on this Head.*

R. Whether you called the Gospel a Law or no, it matters not; I know you kept your self here, as in many other Points within your Trenches, yet he that reads your Book is very blind, if he sees not this to be the Corner-stone of your whole Scheme: And by your now appearing in a Defence of that Principle, as your professed Opinion: You have not only dealt more candidly with your Reader than in your former Book, but also justified me to the World, in these things. 1. That I endeavoured faithfully to represent your Opinions, and did so in this Point. 2. That I wronged you not in saying, Your Art lay in concealing your Tenets from your less intelligent Reader, under Ambiguous and Equivocal Expressions, which I called by a plain English Name that you seem to be offended at. 3. In that I treated you under the Appellation of a *Neonomian* (which is an *Aninomian* in the truest Sense) in that you have in this Reply professedly owned yourself as such, and subscribed to the Truth thereof, which for your own Reputation I would not have had you to have done.

In handling this Question, I shall in the first Place remark upon your stating the Question; and shew its true state.

2. I shall answer your Arguments, to prove the Gospel a new Law.
3. I shall shew what Law and Gospel is?
4. I shall give my Arguments to prove, That the Gospel is no new Law.
5. I shall shew the Beginning and Progress of this great Error; viz. That the Gospel is a New Law.

1. The stating of the Question.

SIR, you tell us, 1. In what Sense you hold the Gospel not a Law; and from thence it follows, That in a Sense it is not a Law, and therefore in mine it may not be a Law.

1. You say, *You do not hold that the Gospel includes nothing, besides this Law,*

R. Here:

R. Here is your old Tricking again : The Question is about the Gospel being a Law, and you say it includes something that is not a Law ; it includes the Covenant of Redemption and absolute Promises, as if the Question were, Whether a Scabbard were a Sword ? And you say, The Scabbard includes a Sword : But, by your Favour, a Law, as such, can't include an absolute Promise, for there's no Promise but conditional in a Law ; but yet an absolute Promise may include a Law, as that, *I will write my Laws in your Hearts. There may be (you say) Prophecies, Histories, Doctrinals, &c. yet these may be called Adjuncts.* Of what ? You should have told us whether of Law or Gospel, or of the Gospel as a Law. The Histories of Christ are Gospel, and the Prophecies of him, and whatever in Doctrinals brings good News to Sinners, belongs to the Promise and Exemplification thereof.

2. You say, p 19. "*Nor do I judge it a Law, in that Sense our Divines fix on Socinians and Arminians.*"

R. No, you apprehend our Divines abuse them, but yet it hinders not but that you may judge it a Law, in the Sense of the Socinians and Arminians : I have told what yours is, let the Reader judge whether it be so or no ; for they hold Justification by Acts of Obedience to this Law but as you do : Nor do they hold that we are justified thereby, as Adam should have been by perfect Obedience.

3. You say, *Nor do I take it in the Popish Sense, which the Socinians and Arminians espouse.*

R. The Popish Sense of Merit is renounced by the Socinians and Arminians, as well as by you, and as much, for ought I can see. The Popish Sense is very plain from the Council of Trent, Anath. 20. Cursed is he that saith the Gospel is a Promise, without a Condition of observing the Command : And this, I am sure, is your Sense. You proceed,

4. "*It is not a Law that supposeth a moral ability in Sinners to perform its Precepts, &c.*"

R. Its unreasonable Law that requires Duty of those that have no ability to perform ; and that Law that makes a Condition, and promiseth Ability, concludes not the Subject till the Power is given ; and, when all comes to all, 'tis but a comprehensive Promise both of the Duty and Benefit to be received by it. You say,

5. *Its not a Law that extinguisheth the Law of Nature, which hath its special Precepts.*

R. If the Law of Nature be the Law of Adam, you say it vacates it : for if it strip it of its Sanction it ceaseth to be a Law, for Sanction is the Law's Ratification as such. Again,

6. *Neither doth this Law require anything of us as a Condition of Christ's coming into the World, nor of the first Grace to the Elect. This the Covenant of Redemption secures to the Catholic Church by Promise.*

R. Whoever talked of our doing any thing, as a Condition of Christ's coming into the World as our Redeemer, but believe it (as weak as you say Mr. C. is) He presume to tell you, that you are bold to attempt to prove the Gospel to be a Law with Sanction : If you allow that the first Grace is absolutely given, and what is given by electing Grace is secured by Election to the Elect ; its an inconsistent Principle that Redemption secures nothing but conditionally, for where the absoluteness of any thing is secured, it is secured to as to cease to be conditional.

6. *Nor is it a Law of Obedience, whereby it renders any promised Blessing a Debt ; all is free though sure ; its free as to procurement or Price, yet it is as sure by Promise as if it were by Debt : The Price was Christ's Obedience and Sufferings, all comes of Gift, yet in that way which God appoints to give it.*

R. This amounts to this much, That now you have dwindled your Law quite away ; for that Obedience that renders not the Promise a Debt, can be no Law with Sanction ; for by the same Reason that the Punishment is due to me upon Disobedience, the Promise is due upon Obedience. You say, Its sure by Promise, so every promissory Covenant makes Blessings sure ; but that which is sure and free, cannot be by Law Conditions.

P. 20. You give us a very long and confused account of your New Law, the sum whereof is, That upon Believing and Persevering in sincere Faith and Holiness, Life and Salvation is promised, and upon non-performance Death and Damnation threatened. The Sense is, Do and live; the very same Essentials as to Matter and Form; the Matter, the Duties and Promises, or Sins and Punishment; the Form is the connection of these together by the Sovereign of Authority of a Law giver. You say, "That you mean by saying, The Gospel is a Law, that God in Christ commands Sinners to receive Christ with a true operative Faith."

R. We grant the Gospel doth so command, but is it a Condition required of the Creature, to be performed in and by his present Abilities? Must he have this first Grace given before he perform the Condition, and by him that commands it? Yet must this Command be a Law with Sanction? No, this Command carries with it to the Effect nothing but a gracious Offer and Invitation, and effectual operative Means to bring a poor Sinner from under a Law with Sanction, to Life and Salvation: *Rom. 5.1. The Wages of Sin is Death*: He lies under this Law-condemnation. *Joh. 3. He is condemned already*: The Gospel calls him not to come under another Condemnation, but it calls him to the Gift of God; What's that? Eternal Life through Jesus Christ; besides God's Commands in the Gospel are gracious, its to such Duties which the same Grace promiseth, and there's no middle between being under the Law and under Grace, under a gracious Command and a legal, they are *adversa sine medio*.

You say, *upon their believing they shall be united to Christ*; therefore they must first do something before Union to Christ, that they may have the Benefit of Union, make the Fruit good, and then the Tree afterward, contrary to one of the fundamental Maxims of our Lord Jesus Christ. You proceed and say, it threatens, *if any dye unbelieving, impenitent, &c. they shall be barred from these Benefits*.

R. The meaning is, They shall die under the Condemnation of the Law they are in already; as much as to say, a Physician offers a Sick Patient a Remedy, he refuseth it, and dies of his Disease, will you say the Physician brought him under a Law, with Sanction? Many such Instances might be given; The King sends a Pardon to all the condemned Prisoners in *Newgate*, suppose it be upon condition of Acceptance; some one accept not, will the Court now try him upon a new Law? No; there's no further Tryal, he is executed upon the Sentence before received: And so are all those Places to be understood that say, *He that believes not shall be damned*: If you say by what Law; I say not by a new one, but by the Old Law. I own, as I believe there are degrees of Glory, according to the degrees of the Vessels of Honour greater or lesser; so there are degrees of Wrath, which the Law will execute according to the degree of Sin; and the Law will look upon rejection of Christ, as the highest degree of Disobedience: Therefore are those Expressions, *it shall be more tolerable for Sodom than for Corazin*; some shall be beaten with fewer, some more Stripes; some counted worthy of sorer Punishments than others; but all this is by the Law, not by the Gospel: And Unbelief and Impenitency are Sins Judged and Condemned with all their Aggravations, severely enough, by that Law, you need not doubt; there needs no new Law to do it. Your referring yourself to the Assembly will cast you, for they never intended any such thing, that the Gospel is a Law.

You say, 1. *Here's the Essentials of a Law, God is our Ruler and we his Subjects*.

R. Are Ruler and Subjects the Essentials of a Law? that's strange Logick: The Ruler in his legislative Power is the efficient; and so in his executive, in application of it to its Ends, and the ruled are therefore called Subjects, because under Subjection to both; the Law is essentially distinct from both. But go on.

His Will revealed in a way of Government, here's the Precept that binds to Duty; here's a Promise made to them that comply, and a Threatning denounced against such as rebel.

R. These

R. These look like Essentials of a Law of Works, such was Adam's Law, there was God's Will for Duty in a way of Government revealed, a Promise to him if he complied, and a Threat denounced, in case he did not : Now then, that Law which hath all the Essentials of a Covenant of Works, is a Covenant of Works : but your new Law, by your Description, hath all the Essentials of a Covenant of Works.

Therefore you say 2. *This is a Law of Grace, and its made by our Redeemer for fallen Man.*

R. Say you so ? 1. That which is made and executed in a way of Judicial Proceeding, is not a Law of Grace; for Grace and judicial Proceeding is diametrically opposite : But you say it's a Law in a way of Government, by a Law therefore of Judicial Proceeding. 2. You say its made by our Redeemer : Is it made with our Redeemer ? I suppose you must mean so, because you say for fallen Man ; then Christ covenanted in our stead, which you deny elsewhere, and he is to perform the Conditions for us. 3. You say, " All the Benefits of it are founded on Christ's Righteousness, as the immediate Cause of them.

R. And where are the Duties founded in Man's Natural Power and Will ? No ; you say in Election absolutely as to the first Grace : Well then, here's the Benefits secured in Redemption, absolutely I hope, and the first Grace in Election : Now if you can tell us where to get Security for after Graces and Perseverance, we should have this whole Covenant absolutely secured. Effectual Ability to perform the Duty (i.e. the first Duty) is provided for, you say, in Election : But is after-Duties provided for there ? if so, election is the sole Covenant Condition for Duty and Redemption for Benefits : Thus you may mangle the Grace of God.

L. Again, you say, *God doth not fix on these Terms for any Worth in them, or Profit to him.*

R. Its true he did not fix on Adam's Terms for any Worth in them ; what proportion could the forbearing an Apple bear to eternal Life, or what Profit would it have been to God, if Adam had let the Apple hang on the Tree, or persevered all his Days in Holiness ?

Mr. W. *The Gospel is the Instrument or Sign by which this Will of God is expressed ; this is not the Language of God in Adam's Law.*

R. An Instrument in this Sense is a Law, Deed or Conveyance, engrossed or enrolled, which is but a small adjunct to the Law. The Scripture of the Old and New Testament are called Instruments, because they are the enrollments of this Will of Christ and his Testament ratified by his Death ; and you say the Gospel is a Sign, the Seals of the Covenant are Signs, but the Covenant of Grace is not a Sign, unless you mean it signifies God's Will and Pleasure in Government, and so did Adam's Law, and was the Language of it.

Mr. W. *It fixeth that Rule of the Promise, which Mr. C. p. 33. is at a loss to know.*

R. And so are more than I : for you say, Its not the Promise nor the Precept, where to find a Rule for the Promise in the Law, I know not, if it be not in Promise or Precept, will you say its the connection of Precept and Promise ? if so its the Rule rather of the Law, *forma perquam lex est* : is it God's Rule to dispense by, or our Rule to claim by ? it may be you mean both, Precepts and Promises are *disparata* at least, therefore what your new Term is, I suppose you do not know what it is yourself, no more than your other new Rules of Sin, which is *ἀνομία*, and misery, *ἡμεῖς*.

Since in stead of clearing the Question you have confounded it, I will take the true state of it from a Man that would speak his Mind more intelligeably in these Matters.

The Question stated.

Scrip. G. *Justific. Contr.* 17. " My true Sense is, That the Covenant of Grace is such a Law, as that the sincere Acts of Faith and Obedience, and perseverance therein are the Conditions upon which eternal Life and Salvation is promised, with a Penalty of eternal Death, threatened upon the non-performance ; only I say that sincere Faith and Repentance are the moral qualifying Conditions of the Continuance of our

" our justification and enjoyment of Heaven. And this is a true Account of the Notion how yourself understands the Gospel to be a new Law ; as I could prove from your own Expressions, even to every word here in this Account, you might therefore have spared yourself and me the labour about your confused stating the Question.

R. Before I answer your Arguments, I shall premise a few things :

1. It being a great End of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the Covenant of Grace, to restore fallen Man, and in so doing to magnifie the Law, he makes full atonement for the breach of it, brings in Everlasting Righteousness, procures New Obedience to the perceptive part of it, teacheth it by his Grace, and works it by his Spirit ; and whereas in the Covenant of Works, Obedience was the Way to, and Condition of the Promise, he makes the Promise] the Way to, and Condition of Obedience, commanding no more than what he hath promised.

2. When we say the Gospel is not a New Law with Sanction, we deny it not to be a Testament that hath its ratification in the Death of Christ the Testator, wherein also the Law of Works had its Sanction, in respect of Penalty, for all those that shall be saved by him, as to satisfaction for their sins.

3. That Rule and Government which Christ exerciseth over his Church, as it comes to him by right of Redemption, so that Obedience we give to him is part of that Eternal Life which he hath purchased and restored to us, and both his government and our subjection thereto is of Promise, and none of the least Blessings and Privileges of the Covenant of Grace.

4. As the Matter of all Precepts, requiring Sanctity and Obedience of Heart and Life, moral and instituted, absolutely considered, primarily belong to the first Law of Works, and so are binding in a natural relation unto Unregenerate and Regenerate, as they are the Commands of God the Creator, and the least Transgression requires a Punishment due to the Breach of the whole Law ; So our Obedience becomes Gospel-Obedience, 1. From our being restored to it in Christ, the second Adam. 2 In that it flows from a new Life given, we must live before we can do. 3. From the end of performance, it's not for Life, as a Law-Reward of it, but for the sake, honour, duty to, and enjoyment of Christ, and in the most grateful returns of his grace and love to us. 4. It's performed from higher Motives and Obligations, viz. that great Love wherewith God hath loved us, constraining us to the highest love and expressions thereof to him.

5. As for all Sin and Disobedience (even Impenitence and Unbelief) to any Commands of the Gospel, it's condemned by the Law ; and every one under the condemnations of Impenitence, Unbelief, rejection of Christ, or disobedience in a Natural Estate, are therein under the Law ; but there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, I mean to their Persons, tho' all their Sins also are condemned by the Law.

2dly. I proceed now to your Arguments.

Mr. W.'s Arg 1. *The Gospel is called a Law, by the Spirit of God, Isa. 42. 4. Mic. 4. 2. Rom. 3. 27. Ch. 10. 31. Jam. 1. 25. and 2. 12. Psal. 19. 7. Gal. 6. 2. Rom. 8. 2.*

R. As to the places quoted out of the Old Testament, as *Isa. 42. 4. Mic. 4. 2. Ps. 19. 7.* I have shewn, that *למורה* signifies Doctrine, and Instruction, and sometimes is taken for the whole revealed Mind and Will of God in the Word, and it's called by the Name of Law, as a part for the whole, both Law and Gospel, in that place, *Isa. 42. 4.* a Prophecy of Christ ; it's a Promise, that the Isles shall wait for Christ's Doctrine, and receive all Commands from Christ, whose Precepts may be called Laws, tho' of another nature than a Law with Sanction ; the preceptive parts of the Gospel are often called Laws, especially in the Old Testament ; but this makes not the Gospel itself a Law, tho' it contain many Precepts. That of *Mic. 4. 2. Psal. 19. 7.* hath the same answer ; those places explicate themselves by the Word of the Lord : *The law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of God from Jerusalem.* So that Law signifies no more than the Word preached, both Law and Gospel ; it were easie to shew how it's used at large in the

Proverbs and *Psalms*, and else where; not under any distinct consideration of Law or Gospel. We have shewed the Covenant of Grace is exhibited only in a way of promise and free-gift unto sinners, as such takes them into Covenant with God, not upon any terms of their doing, perfect or imperfect, performed in their own or another's strength, tho' it takes them into the Kingdom where Christ rules and governs them, and from which Kingdom goes forth all the Word of the Lord, both Law and Gospel. Lastly, The Old Testament speaks often prophetically of the Gospel in its own Terms and Dialect, as by Priests, Sacrifices, &c. *Isa.* 66. 21. c. 56. 7. c. 6. 7. *Ezeki.* 40. c. 41. 42.

That of *Rom.* 3. 27. where the Apostle saith, that boasting is excluded; by what Law? By the Law of Faith, it may be taken for an ordinary rhetorical *figura dictionis*, called *Anadiplosis*; and *Beza* saith, the Apostle doth here, *de industria paravit*; say, the Law of Faith, instead of Faith, because the adversaries of Grace were always wont to have the Name of the Law in their mouths, for which reason our Lord calls Faith, a Work, *Joh.* 6. 29. and on which place he saith, they are plainly ridiculous, who from hence will argue, that Faith is a Work, and that therefore we are justified by Works. But if any that contend for a further account of the meaning of this Expression, 1. It is the Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Christ's Righteousness which he opposeth to all Law-Righteousness, as *Rom.* 4. or other Doctrine that teacheth contrary. 2. It may be taken for the nature of Faith, the power and efficacy of it; the nature of it and its power in the Soul, is to make a Man renounce all inherent righteousness; in the same sense is Law taken, *Rom.* 8. 2. the Law of the Spirit of Life that is in Christ Jesus, viz. i. e. the nature, power, and efficacy of it. So *Rom.* 7. The Law of Sin is no more than the power and prevalency of it, whereby it captivates us. *Jam.* 1. 25. The Law of Liberty is no other than the Gospel-Doctrine of Freedom by Jesus Christ, (*Joh.* 8. 36.) from the Law Moral and Ceremonial for justification, yea, he speaks to them as such (*saith Beza*) on whom no Yoke of Ceremonial Bondage was laid, (as *Peter, Acts* 15. 10.) yea, such as the Moral Law could not retain as Servants under fear, but the Spirit of God forms them into free and voluntary Obedience. Hence it's plain enough, that the Apostle opposeth the Gospel to a Law with Sanction, which enforceth obedience from the threats thereof. So *Beza* carries, c. 2. 12. *This Epistle of Liberty*, saith he, is very fully added, [Having shewed he spake of the Moral Law before, which he called the Royal Law in its full Sanction, as appears from v. 8, 9, 10.] for seeing we are made free by the Son, by a much better right the Lord requires of us the Fruits of Righteousness, rather than of those who remain under the Tyranny of the Law of Sin, &c. So that from these Expressions of *James*, here is so little pretence for a Plea to make the Gospel a Law with Sanction, that the Apostle seems strenuously to argue against it.

I wonder that place is mentioned, *Rom.* 9. 31. the Law of Righteousness, is plainly the Law of Works; for it was Righteousness by this Law they sought after, but lost their labour, not seeking after a Righteousness to satisfy the Law by Faith in Christ.

You argue also from *Gal.* 6. 2. *This is spoken of a particular Precept*, [which are frequently termed Laws or Instructions] *Bear one anothers burdens, and so fulfill the Law of Christ*, or his Command, yea, from an Obligation so to do. (an Obligation to Obedience and Thankfulness is sometimes called a Law of Love.) And what was the obligation? Christ bore our burdens. *Isa.* 53. Therefore we should bear one anothers burdens, as he carried our griefs and sorrows: *Be followers of Christ as dear children.* *Beza* and others refer it to *John* 13. 34, 35. *A new commandment give I unto you, that you love one another as I have loved you, i. e. I give you a new Motive and Principle to act Obedience from: and this is contrary to a Principle and Spirit of Bondage and Fear from a Law with Sanction; and this New Commandment is called the Old, as to the Matter of it.*

Mr. W.'s Arg. 2. *Mens behaviour towards the Gospel is expressed by words that denote it to be a Law; Rom.* 10. 16. 2 *Cor.* 9. 13. 2 *Thess.* 1. 8. 1 *Pet.* 4. 17.

R. You said, tho' the Gospel be a Law with Sanction, yet it contains in it absolute Promises. This I deny, as a contradiction. But I affirm, that an absolute Promise may contain in it Law-Precepts, as that Promise, *I will write my laws in your hearts*; the Gospel sets up the Law-Precepts as Rules of Sanctity and Obedience, and calls for a conformity to them from better Motives and Principles; yet upon better Promises, not such as provoked to obedience, by rewarding the work performed in our own strength, but such as promised the very obedience it self. Therefore no body denies obedience to the Gospel, and subjection to it from the grace of Adoption, as Children, not as Slaves under the rigour of a Law. Those places that speak of taking vengeance on them that obey not the Gospel, *2 Thess. 1. 8. 1 Pet. 4. 17.* they shew only that the curse of the Law will fall more heavily upon them for disobedience to God in the Gospel, Impenitency and Infidelity being Sins the Law of God doth condemn and judge; and Christ will come at the last day clothed with Law-Vengeance, which is called *flaming fire*, and will proceed against all sinners, those that are ignorant of God, and those that are disobedient to the Gospel, and judge them by one and the same Law, tho' some that have added to their other sins the rejection of Christ, and so lye under aggravations of their sins, and are become more inexcusable, may be accounted worthy of sorer degrees of punishment, and judged thereto by the same Law.

M. W.'s Arg. 3. *Justification is a Judicial Act, therefore it must be by a Law.*

R. You should have formed your Argument, and then it would have run thus: If Justification be a Judicial Act, then the Gospel must be Law; but Justification is a Judicial Act: Therefore, 1. I deny the Consequence of the Major; for it may be a Judicial Act in respect of the first violated Law; first a gracious Act of imputing Christ's righteousness to us that may answer the demands of that Law, and then a Judicial Act of acquitting us from the condemnation of it, accounting us in this manner righteous by this Law; and therefore there's no need of another Law for our justification, tho' it be a Judicial Act. You say in Justification is a right to Impunity; and can any thing but a Law give this? but I tell you, it must be the Law that's offended, must discharge in a way of justice from punishment, and not another Law, unless the Pardon be by prerogative or repeal.

M. W.'s Arg. 4. *The Gospel gives a right to its Benefits upon believing.*

R. The Gospel gives nothing but benefits to sinners; Faith is one of the great benefits, and there's a connexion of benefits of different nature in the Gospel-gifts, but our right to all as a federal condition is in Christ, and it's safe enough to speak of Gospel-Worthiness and Rewards, but they are founded in Christ, not in any Law-Righteousness of ours.

M. W.'s Arg. 5. *If God have no Gospel-rule, besides Election and distinguishing Mercy, to confer glory by, then God will not, nay cannot save the non-elect, tho' they should believe in Christ. Say not they will not believe, hath not God declared he will save them if they believe?*

R. First, Here you change the terms, putting Rule for Law, and God's Rule for Man's; therefore you conclude not the Question. 2. You make a Pro-syllogism. Your Argument should regularly run thus: If God hath Gospel-rule, besides Election and distinguishing Mercy, to confer glory by, then the Gospel is a Law; but God hath other Gospel-rules to confer glory by, besides, &c. Therefore, 1. Your Consequence is denied; for if you will have God's way of conferring grace or glory to be a rule to him, the particular application thereof depends wholly upon his good will and pleasure and the manner it self, and that's the rule of all rules; and so the rule of conferring grace and glory is all one: But suppose God's manner of conferring glory be the rule you mean, God never propounded but two ways of doing it, one in a way of free grace and absolute promise, and the other in a way of debt to us by a rule of justice; now your Consequence will sink, for God's rule in bestowing grace and glory upon sinners, is to do it in a way of free grace by promise and gift, and not in a way or by the rule of a Law or distributive Justice. 2. For your Minor it's this, That God hath a Gospel rule, be-

sides Election and distinguishing Mercy, to confer glory by ; which you prove thus, If God hath not, &c. then he cannot nor will not save the non-elect if they believe : But he will save the non-elect if they believe ; therefore, this Argument necessarily supposeth, that God hath a Rule of Salvation altogether independent on Election and distinguishing Mercy, whereby others may be saved if they will ; and you take it for granted, that the non-elect will believe, for you say, say not they will not believe. Your Minor is flatly denied, for that general Proposition, *He that believes shall be saved*, concludes not that a non-elect person shall believe or be saved, it's false Logick so to do ; there's no more in it than in this Proposition, Every Man is a rational Creature, therefore if a Horse be a rational Creature, he is a Man. This connex Proposition hath a verity in the connexion, but determines not any truth in the antecedent or consequent, that a Horse will ever be a Man or a rational Creature. So here, he that believes shall be saved ; therefore then, if the non-elect believe they shall be saved ; if *Judas* believed he should be saved, but this says not that *Judas* will believe or be saved. Yet you say, hath not God declared he will save them if they believe ? I say, no where, he hath not said, I will save a non-elect person if he believe, more than he hath said a Horse shall be a Man if he can use reason or speak, or a Man shall be a Horse if he have four feet. There's hundreds of such Instances : The fire consumes all combustible matter ; if I throw my Coat or Cap into the fire it will be burnt ; but this doth not determine that I will throw it into the fire, or that it will be burnt, but rather the contrary that there will be neither one nor the other : Therefore how bold and illogical is it for you to conclude, that God will save the non-elect upon an imperformable condition ? for whatever hath no other foundation than an impossible condition, can never be ; but the salvation of the non-elect can be founded upon nothing but an impossible condition ; for it can have no other condition, according to you, but believing, and this is impossible, because, according to you, also Faith is from Election, and therefore it's a contradiction to talk of saving non-elect, or God's making a Rule to save them upon supposition of their having that which he never intended to give them. The general Proposition runs thus, All Men that shall believe shall be saved ; a general contradiction here will not divide truth from falshood, *Viz.* No Man shall believe therefore no Man shall be saved ; but to divide truth from falshood and fix it on a subject, the contradiction must be special or proper, and then that general Axiom and Application, specially or properly, makes this Syllogism, All Men that believe shall be saved ; some Men shall not believe, as non-elect, or *Judas*, therefore some Men shall not be saved.

Now see how well you agree with the Assembly in this Point, *ch. 10. §. iv.* they say " non-elect ones, tho' they may be called by the Ministry of the Word, and may have " some common Operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and " therefore cannot be saved.

You say *Forgiveness is an act of Sovereignty*, and how you will reconcile that to what you say before and after, I know not. 1. That it's a judicial Act by a rule of Judgment ; if so, it's not in that respect a sovereign Act, wherein God is free to give faith and forgiveness to whom he will. And, 2. You say, he hath not left himself free to give forgiveness to whom he will of the adult, without faith, and therefore God must come under a Law to give forgiveness in the way of a Law, whereas the same sovereign grace that enclines him to one doth also to the other, and both faith and forgiveness are the free gift in the Promise, in a way of shewing forth his righteousness.

Mr. W.'s Arg. 6. The Apostles, with all the Saints, may be arraigned, as fallen from Grace, and turned from the Gospel, if it be no Rule, according to which God applies Christ's Righteousness, How should Peter, say, Repent and be baptized ?

R. I see no Consequence here at all ; the Argument, to me, seems to run thus : Either the Gospel is a new Law with Sanction, or else the Apostles are fallen from Grace : And what's the reason of this forced Argument ? The Apostles preached, *That*
Men

Men should repent and be baptized. I hope you will make Baptism too to belong indispensably to the new Law, as a Condition; but I pray, doth the Gospel, requiring and calling for Gospel Duties, make the Gospel a new Law with Sanction? Are not Gospel Duties from Gospel quickning and enlivening a poor dead Sinner to obey, the Gospel Commands of Christ to an Unbeliever? He doth not deal with him as a Person under a moral Power to answer them, and therefore putting him under trial by his natural strength, as all Laws do; but Gospel Commands are as Christ's Voice to *Lazarus* in the Grave, *Joh. 5. 25*. I pray by what Law are dead Men capable of coming to Life? The Gospel is the power of God to Salvation, not the power of Man. You alledge the Gaoler's words, *Act. 16. 36. What shall I do to be saved.* I wonder you should insist upon the words of a Man that knew not Christ, and knew no other way of Salvation than by doing. *Paul* indulged him not in this Opinion, but taught contrary, exhorting him to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, which the Apostle always opposed to doing; Faith being a Grace that excludes works of any Law, yea, it self as a work; it will ascribe all to Christ and free Grace: It's new Doctrine, that a Command to believe, should be a Command to work for Life, as the obedience to a Law, when it calls Men from under the Law; and it saith, That a Believer, is not under the Law, but under Grace: It should have said, you are not under the old Law, but you are under the new Law. You instance in *Gal. 2. 16. I say* there, doth not denote a priority in time of Faith to Justification, but of the end of Faith; we should believe, for this end, that the Grace of Justification by Christ's Righteousness alone may shine into our Hearts, by the light of Faith, that we may have Peace with God in our Consciences through the Lord Jesus Christ; and so we do not only in our first believing, but in all other Acts. And this hinders not but that God's gracious Acts prevent ours and causeth them; God's love let forth to us constrains us, and is the reason of our loving him. Justification may be considered as terminating on our Persons, and terminating on our Consciences; in this last sense the Apostle speaks; but note what is the Antithesis, And not the Works of a Law. If he had not meant the Works of every Law, he should have distinguished, and said, Not by the Works of the old Law, but by the Works of the new Law: It's strange he should keep the *Galatians* in the dark, about the Works of the new Law; it was but Works that they looked for to joyn with Christ in Justification. I am confident this very distinction would have satisfied all the Neonomians of his time.

Mr. W.'s 7th Arg. The Gospel is at least part of the Rule by which Christ will judge the World; this must be a Law if it be a Rule of Judgment.

R. Your Argument is, That Rule, by which God will judge the World, is a Law, but the Gospel is a Rule by which God will judge the World; therefore, I deny the Minor.

1. You say, Part of that Rule; I pray what's the other part? Will the Rule of Judgment have two parts? Do you mean the old Law will be another part? Or will God judge some by the old Law, some by the new?

2. It's not likely that God will judge the World by any more than one Law, and that, the Law of Creation, and that by which he governed the World; that Law which hath been the Standard of Righteousness from the beginning of the World to the end.

3. It's likely to be that Law that all the World are become guilty by; they shall not be guilty by one Law and judged by another.

4. It's likely to be that Law that Men's Consciences accuse or excuse by.

5. It's likely to be that Law that will reach Jews, Christians, Infidels, and all that never had the written Law or Gospel.

6. If the Gospel be a Law then, to try by, it must cease to be a Gospel, for it will bring execution of Indignation and Wrath, no good Tidings; I suppose you will not say, the Sentence, *Go ye cursed*, is Gospel. Well, you say,

The Work of that day is not to try Christ: No sure, I believe not; but Christ must sit upon his Throne judging the World. "Nor whether Christ's Righteousness was imputed to all that Believe; but will be to decide the cause of all Men, to silence all Apologies

"logies, &c. 1. I suppose you mean to decide Believer's state, which hath been undecided till then. 2. To prove that the rest of the World had not Faith. As for the first sort, I would know whether their Tryal will be before the Resurrection or after? Before it can't be, they must be raised first; and those that die in Christ shall rise first. And its said, *Blessed and happy are they that have part in the first Resurrection*; and how shall they be raised? Incorruptible, in Glory, like to Christ at his Appearance immediately carried up into the Air to meet the Lord. Is it likely that now they are clothed with all this Glory, at the Resurrection, they shall come to stand a Tryal for Justification? Surely their state will be fully decided, before Christ will raise them in this Glory. But you say, their Faith must come to tryal whether it hath been sincere; but undoubtedly that will be fully resolved before the Resurrection; or how shall the Elect be gathered from all Parts? And how shall Christ distinguish the Saints from others to raise them in Glory?

But you'll say, this Tryal will be by the new Law at the Resurrection of the Unjust. 1. Shall they not be raised in Dishonour, with their Consciences accusing them by the old Law? 2. How few, in comparison, will there be of the Millions of wicked that can be justified by the new Law that never heard a word of it? 3. Those that have heard of it, never owned it, or were under it; they must be tried by a Law that nature hath brought them under. 4. All their Sins against God's Offers and Commands are judged by the old Law; for in the moral Law, God is declared a God that shews Mercy unto thousands. 5. The Offers of Mercy rejected, are but Aggravations of the Sins of those that are condemned already, and make them more inexorable. In this sense the Men of Nineveh, and the Queen of the South, shall rise up in judgment against some, and condemn them; not that their Actions shall be a Law to try by, but that they will be matter of Aggravation to such as had greater means of Grace than they had. Rejections of Pardon do not bring condemned Persons to a new Law to Try them by; it leaves them but under the former Law and Condemnation, with a greater Torment upon their Minds and Consciences. For my part, I look upon your whole Hypothesis, about the day of Judgment, to be very raw and indigested, in that you suppose it will be like Man's Assizes, when all Men shall be brought to a personal Tryal, good and bad, all in mixture, and Believers as well as Unbelievers must be Arraigned, and hold up their Hands at the Bar, and stand upon their Delivery; whereof some upon a formal Tryal shall be justified, others condemned.

I come to shew what a Law is, and what Gospel is.

What a Law is.

The word *Lex* is with some a *Ligando*, because it binds to Duty and Obedience; with others it is a *Legendo*, *because among the Romans, when a Law

* Quod omnibus ad legendum exponitur publice in foro quod dicebatur promulgatio legis. Isidor

Νόμος λόγος ἐστὶν ὡς ἐκ μέρους καὶ διὰ τὸ λόγια καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μέλλουσιν πρὸς ἐκτέλεσιν ἔχειν. Aristot.

was made, it was exposed publicly, that all might read or know it; and this was called the promulgation of the Law, Νόμος, ἀπὸ τοῦ νέμω, a *tribuendo* aut *distribuendo*, because it gives every one its due, by commanding and forbidding, upon a Penalty exact or understood. Hence it is not only *regula justæ & injustæ*, (which describes but the preceptive part) but its *regula sancta* whereby Justice doth proceed in a way of distribution to justify or condemn, and thereby *sum cuique tribuere*, to give every one his due, if Wages of Sin be due, to pay it; this is the primary and strict sense of νόμος; in a larger sense it's taken for Doctrine, a Custom or Usage, חוק comes of חורר, *Instituit, docuit, monuit*, &c. and is often used for Doctrine or Institution in the *Proverbs* and *Psalms*; sometimes

it, &c. and is often used for Doctrine or Institution in the *Proverbs* and *Psalms*; sometimes

times for the Law of God strictly taken, sometimes for the Law of *Moses*, and sometimes for a particular Law or Precept, as *Exod.* 12:49. Sometimes for the Doctrine of the revealed mind of God in his word, *Psal.* 1. 19. and 119. And sometimes for a Manner and Custom, as 2 *Sam.* 7. 19. In which Significations its by the Hebrew derived from *חוק*. They have also divers other words for particular Statutes, Precepts, Commandments; in treating of which, I shall not detain the Reader.

2. A Law in general is an explicit Injunction of Obedience by a rightful Power, with a Penalty annexed. Duty may be owing where its not by any positive Law prescribed on Penalty. There are these things necessary to a Law. 1. That there be a legislative Power lodged somewhere: That it be Sovereign, whereby the first Reason of the Law is the good Will and Pleasure of the Law-giver. 2. That this Sovereign Power be rightfully exerted, or else the Law is but an Usurpation: 3. That the Subject under this Law be capable of performing it, or else the Law is tyrannical. 4. If a Promise of Reward to Obedience be express or implied, it becomes a Law-Covenant: But concerning the Nature of that more may be said elsewhere.

3. In a Law there is but two Parts, the preceptive part and sanction; which is binding the Subject to Duty, upon the Authority of the Law-giver, and on pain of Curse denounced for the Transgressions thereof. You oft reflect on me for being ignorant of what Sanction is; I must tell you, I understood *Sancire* before you began to study, at five Years old, as you say you did; and if any one speak of Life and Death distinct from the Precept, its you, when you talk of continuing the Duty and removing the Sanction to another Law; for the removing the Sanction from a Law, is the taking away all the binding Nature of it; and these things are inseparable from a Law with Sanction. 1. Every such Law requires perfect Obedience to the conditional Precepts of whatever kind they be; if the Law require of me a small Matter or a great, it abates not one jot or tittle of what it requires, and my performing that is perfect obedience to the said Law. If the King's Law require one Milling Poll-Tax of me, eleven pence three Farthings half farthing will not pay my due, nor be accepted. Hence, 2. whereas the Law requires the full Duty without the least Abatement, so if I make the least Default of what it requires, I fall under the Curse of it; and he that is thus by the least Default, whatever his compliance or obedience is besides, is under a Curse unavoidably, the whole Penalty falls upon him. Thus much for a Law in general, whether Divine or Human, none allows an imperfect Performance of Conditions required in the said Law, but condemns it.

4. The Law of God is a strict Injunction to Man of Obedience to all his revealed Mind, and Will, upon pain of Death. The Original Record of this Law was in Man's Heart, concreated with him; *Adam* had by Nature the things contained in the Law, a few dark Remains whereof continue in fallen Man in his sinful Condition: This not only comprehended those Precepts which the Jews call the Law of Nature, which are *Badem apud omnes homines in omni tempore & omni loco*. Which are the same among all Men, and in every Place: But it requires exact Obedience to any particular, or more peculiar Precepts that God afterward should require Obedience by, of any one Person, or sort of People, even God's extraordinary Commands, such as to *Abraham* of offering up his Son. Again, it doth not bind only to the external Acts of Obedience but to the internal, and the Principle from whence it flows, *Mat.* 5. 21, 27. c. 22. 37, 38, 39. This Principle and internal heart Conformity Man had at the first; "All Prescription of Duty belongs to the Law," as *Voss. disput. tom.* 4. 24. And this we must hold, if with all the Reformed we will "maintain the Law's Perfection, as containing in its compass all Virtues and Duties" of Holiness, *Winf.* 197. de *jude*. Hence whatever is a Transgression of ours in a Defect of Obedience to any of God's Precepts, that were or should be given, the very least,

Lex Adamo data fuit naturalis vel positivae, illa in imagine Dei involtebatur & in corde scripta. Rom. 2. 14, 15. Lex positivae consistebat in prohibitione arboris scientiae boni & mali, Gen. 2. 17. Lei.

least, though but in a defect of Faith or Love to God in the Heart, is condemned by God's Law: Will any Man say that God hath commanded Faith and Repentance at any Time to Man, and that was not implied in the Law at first given to Man, both not that Law condemn every Disobedience, Impenitency and Unbelief; and if it condemns the Sins it commands the Duties. The Law of Creation condemned all Sin, which could not be but by the Fall, and hence commanded all contrary Duty, and therefore Repentance in case of Sin.

5. This Law was twice solemnly promulgated, 1. To Adam in *Paradise*, in which Promulgation God did bring him upon the trial of his Obedience in one particular Precept or Prohibition, as a part of his Revealed Mind and Will; and likewise declared the Penalty of the Breach of the whole Law in that sin. 2. On Mount *Sinai*, which Law was but a recognizing and transcript of the said Original Law, writ in Man's Heart, but so as to be expressive of the fallen state of Man; in which Law, though but a brief Summary in ten Heads what was that moral Obedience God at first required of Man, yet therein its abundantly declared, That Man by a moral Obligation was bound to observe whatever God enjoyed as a Duty to Sinners in Faith and Repentance, and in all Matters of instituted Worship under the Old or New Testament, in the first Table, and most especially in the first and second Commandments: Though those particular Commands as to the Mosaic Institution were alterable, yet they being the revealed Mind and Will of God, for the time being, Men lay under a moral Obligation as the Principle and Foundation of that Obedience: So where-ever God commands and requires any Duty

De comminationibus si qua sunt in fœdere gratie videamus, si accurate rem putare volumus, &c.

Though the Gospel seems to have Comminations in it, yet if we accurately consider the Matter, the Covenant of Grace hath no peculiar Comminations; all Comminations or Threats belong to the Law; which Law, as to all its Parts, doth accommodate, and suits itself to the Covenant of Grace, *Wils. de sed.*

in the Gospel, the Law primarily obligeth us to Obedience, and will revenge all Disobedience and Imperfection, if we are not secured from its Curse in some way of perfect Satisfaction and Obedience; there needs no other Law with Sanction to try and execute a Transgressor by: This is the Law by which all the World becomes guilty before God; by which he governeth the World, condemns every Sin in the very regenerate, and every impenitent Unbeliever; and by this Law, and it only Christ will judge the World. Neither doth the greatness and Aggravation of any Sin, remove it to the trial of another Law, as in refusal of Gospel Remedy, but leaves Men the more inexcusable under a higher degree

of punishment inflicted by the same Law: And whereas that Place, *Rom. 2. 16.* is alleged to prove the Change of the Law-Sanction, and that it is not the Law of Nature but the Law of the Gospel by which Christ will judge the World: The allegation is grounded on a manifest Mistake, for mark what is said, *v. 16.* In its next coherence it belongs to *v. 12.* (for *v. 13, 14, 15.* are shut in by a Parenthesis) and then the sense is plainly thus, *as many as have sinned in the Law shall be judged by the Law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of Men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel, κτ' τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου, i. e.* according as I have preached, That Christ shall judge the World by the Law; for he saith two sorts of Men shall be judged by the Law, such as had never no Law, but what was written in their Hearts, and such as had the written Law; and Christ shall judge them both, according to the Truth of the Gospel which he had preached, *Acts 17. 31.* and this is according to the account *Mr. Beza* gives of the Text.

6. Hence the Law of God is but one from first to last; indeed in this one Law there are many Precepts, ten in the Mount *Sinai* Law, and those ten contain multitudes of Duties in other places of Scripture more particularly expressed: And upon this Foundation of Obedience is built all the Ceremonial Laws and Judicial, which had but a Temporary Sanction; and no more hath the instituted Gospel worship, and are but Branches that fall off; but our Obedience to them for their time is Moral, because they are the Command of God, and that Moral Duty to conform to the revealed Mind and Will of God, remains,

mains and will be our Glory in Heaven, though particular Circumstances and Actions wherein this Obedience is now ordinarily exprest, will cease : Hence it was not needful that Christ should exert his perfect Obedience in those Circumstances and Actions which do attend all the Varieties of States, Stations and Relations that we are in, neither would it have been essential to Adam's perfection if he had sinned, nor will it be to glorified Saints. To conclude the Law of God is perpetual, and its an eternal Truth, *do and live*, as that the Soul that Sins shall dye, Not one jot or Tittle of the Law shall pass away till all be accomplished, Heaven and Earth shall pass away first, *Matt. 5. 18.* not that it is vacated when fulfilled, but established : And our Saviour tells us, *That he that will break one of the least of these Commandments, and teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven ;* What must they then be called, who tell us, God hath vacated this Holy, Righteous and Good Law, and brought in another in the room of it that dispenseth with little Sins, and makes them not of a damning Nature.

תורה, The Law is the whole Rule of Obedience: which God gave to the Church under the Old Testament. It was a perfect and compleat Rule of Obedience, which God required of his Church, the moral Law the Foundation of the whole both Ceremonial and Judaical. By vertue of that Covenant made with Abraham it was accompanied with a Power and Efficacy enabling unto Obedience. The Law in it self is merely preceptive and commanding, admitteth no Power and Ability unto those that were under its Authority, no more do the meer Commands of the Gospel. Under the O. Testament, it enforced Obedience from the severity of its sanction. D.O. of Jult. p. 4. 13, 144.

II. Concerning the G O S P E L :

What Gospel is.

1. The English Word *Gospel* comes from *Good, God, or Ghost, and Spell*, which signifies a Word or Saying, so that Gospel is as much as a Good Word, a comfortable Word or Saying of God, or the Spirit, *Εὐαγγέλιον*, the proper Signification of it is a good Message, or joyful News ; and so its used by *Aristophanes and Appian*, and in that Sense *Εὐαγγέλιον* is used *Matt. 11. 5. Rom. 10. 15. Luc. 2. 10, 11. The LXXII. use it expressly for good Tidings, 2 Sam. 4. 10. and so Isa. 52. 7. The Gospel that we are to believe as the Glad Tidings of the Kingdom of Heaven, Mar. 1. 15. Luk. 2. 10. The Publication of Christ's Doctrine, 1 Cor. 4. 15. Rom. 1. 1. The Gospel of Ages or eternal Gospel, Rev. 14. 6. I know no place that it is used otherwise than for acceptable News, and glad Tidings, and no where in the Sense of a Law or Law-Covenant ; and it can be no otherwise, because to whom are these glad Tidings brought, but to poor Sinners, that are fallen under the Law, become guilty before God, utterly hopeless and helpless in themselves ? and by the said Law, or any Law that requires the least degree of Holiness as a federal Condition of Life and Salvation. Christ himself *Luke 4. 18. from Isa. 61. 1.* tells us who he came to preach Gospel good Tidings to, it was to the poor, broken-hearted, Captives, Blind, Imprisoned. The Hebrew Word *בשר* is of the same signification, and *בסורר* Chald. and Syr. See *Isa. 40. 9.**

The Word comes of *eu bene*, and *aggelōs nuntius*, & est laetum vel felix Nuntium.

2. Now then the Gospel is the Manifestation of the Grace of the Covenant, the good News and glad Tidings of Life and Salvation, promised in the Covenant of Grace to Transgressors of the Law, that lye under the Curse of it, and was promulgated immediately after the Fall (before the Sentence was passed) by way of Promise, without the least mention of a New Law or Law Conditions to be performed by Man to invest him in the said Promise: The Promise was to Christ and of Christ, That he should destroy the Work of the Devil, and spoil Principalities and Powers, and give Life to the World, that the Devil by his Subtily and Malice had plotted to destroy ; and as he thought had effected the total Ruine and Destruction of. The like Promise was to

E

Abraham 430 Years before the Law: The manner of this Salvation was soon exemplified in Sacrifices, in *Adam's Family*, as Types of Christ the great Sacrifice for Sin; they were continued in the Families of the Faithful both before and after the Flood, and in *Abraham's* and the Patriarchs till the Church of *Israel* was erected and organized in the Wilderness, when the whole Ceremonial Service was established, the Economy whereof was but an entire Type of Christ and the Gospel in the Tabernacle and Temple, State of the Church; so that the whole Service was no more than their Gospel, wherein Christ was daily preached to them: Which Gospel of theirs laboured under much faultiness, comparatively to what it was afterward at the Appearance, and by the Ministry of Christ and his Apostles, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9, 10. compared with *Eph.* 3. 5, 6.

1. This Gospel brings Life and Immortality to Light by the Promise, which was not so clearly discovered before Christ's Incarnation and Ministry, *Eph.* 3. 5. He appears to be the great Sacrifice so long fore-typified, as likewise the great Priest that was to come, after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, and the great Prophet *Moses* prophesied of: To him gave all the Prophets Witness, and *John the Baptist* pointed him out, As the Lamb of God that took away the Sins of the World; and that he had received the Spirit without Measure. The History of Christ's Life, Doctrine, Death and Exaltation are eminent Proofs of these glad Tydings, from whence the four Evangelists are rightly named. The Witness and Ministry of the Apostles contain likewise the same, whereby there is the giving the Knowledge of Salvation, *Luke* 1. 77. and that through this Knowledge we should have all things pertaining to Life and Godliness, 2 *Pet.* 1. 3.

2. The Promise of the Gospel to us, contains all good News, being free and absolute to Sinners (such 2 *Tim.* 1. 15. 1 *Job.* 5. 11. ch. 2. 25.) of Christ and of Eternal Life and Salvation in him. 2. Promises of the first Grace freely and graciously bestowed on us as of Faith, *Eph.* 2. 8. the Spirit, *Luke* 11. 12, 13. the new Creation, *Eph.* 2. 10. and free Justification, *Ezek.* 36. 25. the new Heart, 26. a Promise to make us to walk in his ways, and that we shall be his People, *ibid.* a Promise to be taught of God, *Job.* 6. 45. *Isa.* 54. 13. Yea the bringing us into a true Gospel Obedience to the Law, *Jer.* 31. 33. the making Christ our Wisdom, Righteousness and Sanctification, 1 *Cor.* whereby Obedience to God's Law is graciously given us, *Psal.* 119. 29. the promise of Perseverance, that we shall not depart from God, *Jer.* 32. 40.

3. The Promises made to Christ, and of Christ, wherein our absolute Salvation is wrapped up, so as to be a Covenant, *Isa.* 42. 6. c. 49. 6. c. 53. 11, 12. Promises to him of the Throne and Dominion of *David*, in a spiritual Sense, such as concern his priestly and prophetic Offices, as *Heb.* 7. *Pf.* 10. To instance in all would be long.

4. All the Names of Christ, as *Messias*, *Jesus*, *Emanuel*; the account of his Natures, of his Offices, of his Office in general, Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour; of Christ in particular, of his Prophetick, Priestly, Kingly Offices; his exercise of them, and his excellent Spirit which he shewed therein, full of Meekness, Compassion, Wisdom and Zeal. All this is Gospel, and good News to Sinners.

5. The gracious free Invitations that are made to Sinners, as *Isa.* 55. 1. *Mat.* 11. lat. 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. with Promises for Encouragement. Here's high and rich Gospel.

6. The Promise of Principle and Strength to perform every Duty required; of his Spirit to work in us to will and do; of God's Love shed abroad in our Hearts to constrain us, of life itself; and that he will be the Resurrection and Life; of Love, springing from the Love of God; of making us good Trees, that we may bring forth good Fruit, is all wonderful Gospel.

7. All the Discoveries Christ hath made of his Father; his eternal Election, his transacting with him in a Covenant-way, shewing us the Mystery of the Father, revealing him, by his glorious Designs to glorify his Justice and Mercy, in such a way of Salvation; his Designs to magnify his Law, and make it honourable; to exalt his Son Jesus to be a Prince and Saviour; and give Remission of Sins; to exalt his free Grace in this Salvation by a free justification, adoption, sanctification, and glory; and in doing this, Justice should lose nothing of its due, is all great and glorious Gospels. 8.

8. That in all these great and precious things, there is such a connexion together that one encourageth and leadeth to another, Promise leads to Duty, and Duty to the receiving of Promises, Grace leads to Glory, and that Perseverance is as infallibly settled in electing Grace, and as absolutely as the first Grace. This is admirable Gospel.

9. The great and clear discoveries that are made of the evil of sin, of the dangers sin leads to, and sinners are in and running into, by continuing in sin, and laying open the strict nature of the Law; that it dispenseth not with the least sin, it requires still perfect righteousness and holiness, and sentenceth the sinner to eternal death and damnation for it; and therefore it's impossible, that any flesh living, by ordinary descent from Adam, can be justified by the Works of the Law; it's a gracious and necessary piece of Gospel to take off a poor sinner from the love of sin and fondness of his own righteousness, which every sinner by nature is apt unto, and to set up the Lord Jesus as the only Name whereby he can be saved, and to shew, that he is able and willing to live to the uttermost, whereby a sinner becomes dead to the Law, and married by faith unto Jesus Christ. This is in the glorious Gospel of God and our Saviour: It is the light of it that shines into the heart doth this.

10. It is good News and glad Tydings, that the grace of God in the Gospel doth not make void the Law, but establisheth it, Rom. 3. 31. Neither is the Law against the Promise, Gal. 3. 21. tho' that he that is under a Law for justification, is under a Curse, and that by the oeconomy of the grace of Christ in the New Covenant, the Law and Gospel do sweetly harmonize: 1. In that the Law hath been fulfilled in Christ as to all righteousness, it hath a full Sanction as to every believer in the active and passive obedience of Christ; their delivery from the curse of it being by this, that he was made a curse for them; all their sins are condemned in his flesh, he bearing them on the Cross; the Law hath its end as to all righteousness and compleat perfect holiness in Christ; believers are all compleat and perfect in Christ as to the Law. 2. It's good News, that Christ's death was not only the satisfying of the Law and Justice of God on the account of our sins, and, together with his active obedience, the merit of grace and glory; but that this same death of Christ was the Sanction and Ratification of all the Grace of the New Covenant, as a Testament, being by the death of the Testator, and as a Law to Christ, which he lay under by his Father's injunction to perform. And this is the Sanction spoken of Heb. 8. 6. and more fully explained, c. 9. 15 16, 17. compared with c. 10. 7. 3. It's good News to a believer, that God hath provided a way for him to come into an acceptable obedience through Jesus Christ, to the Law of God, because the Grace of the Gospel causeth him to love the Law and the Commands of Christ in the Gospel-way of performance. He saith, *Oh how do I love thy law; Oh that my ways were directed to keep thy statutes;* and he desires, that now God would grant him his Law graciously: see Psal. 119. For the grace of God in the Gospel writes the Law in his heart in a true love to God with all his heart, and a love to the Law of God, to the holiness, justice and goodness of it, and his great desire is now, that in Christ Jesus, and conformity to him, God's Law may be honoured, and therefore he looks upon the very performance of holy Duties accordingly, as his benefit and privilege by the grace of the Gospel: Christ is sanctification to him, he is created in Christ Jesus to good works, he is redeemed from all iniquity, Tit. 2. 12, 13. and taught by the grace of God to deny all ungodly and worldly lusts, &c. from love and thankfulness to Christ to keep his Commandments; and this New Gospel restored Principle of obe-

Lex attemperata faderi gratia & juxta illud inscripta cordi electorum jubet ea omnia quae in Evangelio proponuntur, sile non sibi amplecti & convenienter isti gratia & gloria vitam suam insi suere. Quando ergo Deus in fadere gratiae promittit peccatori electa fidem Resipiscientiam & consequenter vitam aeternam, tum Lex cuius obligatio nunquam potest solvi quae; ad omne officium sese extendit obstringit hominem ut illi veritati assentiat, promissa illa bona magni faciat, impense desideret, quærat, amplectatur.

Witt. de Fœd. p. 198.

dience is the New Commandment spoken of *Job. 13. 34. 1 Job. 2. 7, 8. 2 Job. 5.* not that it was materially a New Command. 4. Lastly, It is great and good Tydings, that Jesus Christ is set on the Holy Hill of *Zion*; that he is King, Head and Governour to his Church; and that he hath provided particular right Laws, Rules and Precepts for them to walk by, according to the original design, purity and intention of God's Law; and that now the Law of God goes no longer out of Mount *Sinai*, but out of Mount *Zion*, and the Word of the Lord from the heavenly *Jerusalem*, *Isa. 2. 2, 3. Mic. 4. 1. Heb. 12. 18, 22, 23.* And it's Gospel, that all Power is not only given to Christ in his Church as King thereof, but all Power in Heaven and Earth is committed to him, as to governing Providence, and that he shall judge the World at the last day. These things are all the good Tydings of the Gospel, ratified in the Covenant of Grace, graciously, freely and fully bestowed on us in the Gospel, and upon no federal condition of our own performance, either before or after conversion.

Arguments that the Gospel is not a New Law with Sanction.

Arg. 1. If Law and Gospel are specifically distinct, then the Gospel is not a Law, nor the Law a Gospel, but Law and Gospel are specifically distinct, therefore the Gospel is not a Law. The consequence of the Major is undeniable to any one that understands the nature of Genus and Species. The revealed offers of salvation were never but by two ways to Man, by Works and by Grace, that is called Law, this Gospel, and they are *contra distinct, sub proximo genere, and adversa*, as much as *homo et brutum sub animali*; and the Law can no more be called Gospel, or the Gospel a Law, than a Man may be called a Brute, or a Brute a Man.

1. Law and Gospel-grace are opposed expressly by the Spirit, *Job. 1. 17. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.*

Evangelium non esse legem, sed ab ea plurimum distinctum tum ipsa arguit appellatio quam ponderat, Theophyl. in Præf. Matth. & Euseb. l. 1. in præparatione Evang. c. 1. Tum manifesta Antithesis que est, Joh. 1. 17. Rom. 10. 5, 6. Tum utriusque discrimen situm in pæfationis ordine natura, promulgatione, ministerio in forma seu differentia promissionum in effectis, adjunctis efficacis, officio utriusque in applicatione ad objecta: tum constitutus Ecclesie purioris consensus que semper Evangelium a lege discrete quemadmodum, Cyril. Alex.

Here is not a Law and a Law opposed, but a Law and Grace essentially differing; for an old Law and a new do not differ essentially, but *secundum adjuncta* only, in the like manner and for the same end; Christ and Moses are opposed, Christ as a Son, to Moses as a Servant, one being a Minister of the Law, the other of the free grace of the Gospel, *Heb. 3. 5, 6.* As Mediators, one of a legal administration, that veiled the grace of the Gospel; Christ such a Mediator of the New Testament, who brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel, *2 Tim. 1. 10.* Upon the account of this specific difference of Law and Gospel, it is that Mount *Sinai* and Mount *Zion*, or *Jerusalem* that is above, the heavenly are opposed to the earthly in that Spiritual Allegory of *Hagar* and *Sarah*, applied *Gal. 4. 24, 25.* which opposition between these Mounts is fully and admirably managed by the Apostle, *Heb. 12. 18, 22.* To this let me add the specific difference that is made between those that are under one and under the other, *Rom. 6. 14.* There are some under the Law, and some under grace; he saith not some

under an old Law, some under a new; but what's the condition of them under the Law? sin reigns unto death; but as to those under Grace, grace reigneth through righteousness [i. e. of Christ, not of works of our obedience to any Law] unto eternal life. Lastly, The opposition made between the Works of the Law and the Grace of the Gospel, is in the point of justification; the Works of the Law, or any Law, are peremptorily rejected by the Apostle in the point of justification; so that if Grace justified in a way of Works, Grace and Works here could not be opposed: See those

two famous places that peremptorily reject all Works of what kind soever, of what Law soever, from Justification, *Rom. 3. 20. Gal. 2. 16.* where its said by the Works of a Law, *ἐξ ὧν οὐ μὴ*. no Flesh living shall be justified: It is reasonable to think, that if the Apostle had intended we should be justified by any Law, that he would not have told us by what Law-Works? Would he have spoken so universally of all Law-Works? Are not all good Works, towards God and Man, commanded in the Law? But are some Works of one Law and some of another? This Remark of mine, about leaving out the prepositive Article, shewing that the Words of all Laws are indefinitely here meant, you would blow away as a Cobweb: Your words are, *Upon such Cobwebs, in the face of the plain scope of the Bible, doth this Cause stand.* Cobwebs are fit enough to catch Flies in; but I never fear an Adversary that spits at Arguments instead of answering them. Where's the Argument, you say, because in a few places the Article *α* is not put in? [You should have said *τῷ*.] "Therefore the Apostle excludes every sort, when he plainly excludes only one sort, as appears by the whole Context; nay, when at the same time another Species under that general, *Rom. 3. 27.*

R. Therefore Ver. 20. We have the general of all Laws, there's no justification by the Works of a Law; and know you not that which is denied to the Genus as such, is denied to the Species; and tho' he mentions a Law of Faith, *vi. 27.* in the sense or senses which have been above mentioned, yet it is manifest that he absolutely denies Justification to Faith as a Law-Work; for else, why had he not excepted Faith as a Law-Work, when he excludes all Works? And when he sheweth all Works are excluded, he saith, where is boasting then? Saith he, it is excluded by the Nature and Power of true Faith, which will always lay the Creature low, and exclude all matter of Boasting that may be in us; he saith not, we are justified by Faith as a Work of the new Law; but saith, that Faith stands up against all such Works, and Law-Justification; and this is witnessed *συνέχεται*, by the Law and the Prophets, *i. e.* by the Mosaical Ministry, as well as the Prophets, were the prepositive Points at Law, in a peculiar sense; but what is it that's witnessed? It's that the Righteousness of God is manifested, *ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ*, without a Law, any Law for Justification by Gospel grace. You mistake if you apprehend we make this our great Argument, to prove that the Gospel in its nature is not a Law with Sanction; it is the plain scope and design of the Apostle, in all those places where he disputes against Justification by Works, that we argue from, and make use of this observation, as a corroborating Argument, that his plain intent is to exclude, not only the Works of the moral Law, but the Works of any Law; for the Apostle deals with the *Galatians*, which hankered after Circumcision, and under pretence of observation of some of the Mosaical Ceremonies, would have introduced the Works of the Law to share in the Matter of their Righteousness: And, therefore, by using Law in the largest and most comprehensive sense, he casts out all Law-Works as conditions of Justification; and this is the sense Mr. Beza hath of the Apostle's Scope on *Rom. 3. 20.* "St. Paul having proved the World to be guilty before God, and lyable to his Wrath, he concludes that which he undertakes to prove, *viz.* That no Man could be justified by the Works of any Law; for having disproved one part of the disjunct Proposition, he establisheth the other, *viz.* Seeing we are not justified by a Law; therefore, only by Faith in Christ alone, Christ apprehended by Faith, as the Gospel teacheth that we are both justified and saved; therefore, that the Gospel is the power of God unto Salvation to every Believer; which was the state of the Question, as laid down in the beginning of the Epistle. He tells us what doth therefore shew or demonstrate these things duly considered; that in this Verse, by the naming the Law without an Article, all Doctrine is understood, whether Written or not, which doth command or forbid any thing, as the series of his Arguments; and that effect

Alexand. in c. 40. Isa. Hieron. l. 1. Contra Pelagianos & plurimorum ubi opus adduci possunt testimonia. Christop. Pelargi Jesuitinus, p. 71. Imprel. An. D. 1658.

"effect which he ascribes to the Law, in discovering Sin doth prove; you may see much more in him to this purpose: The Works of the Law are called the doing of those things, which the Law commands, as they are done by us, or not done by us, not as simply commanded by the Law. Now I suppose you will not call this learned Man's arguing here a Cobweb. It were easy to shew upon what probable Reasons the Prepositive is added or omitted, in other places of the Epistles where Law is

mentioned, which to avoid prolixity I must now omit. It's enough at present that it is left out in these eminent places, where Justification by any Works of any Law, is utterly denied and condemned. It's frivolously objected by you, that the omission of the Article here, argues not; "because the Socinians would improve the leaving out of *6, Job. 1. 1.* against the Deity of Christ; and say the word was a God, not the God; a God by office, (as one preached at *P. H.*) whereas its in that Text an Argument against them, and there is doublets a great force in it; for as Mr. *B.* saith by the first words, the word was in the beginning, the eternal Essence of the Son is asserted. 2. By the next, The Word was with God, *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν* (where the Article is express, and the Person of the Son is distinguished from the Person of the Father, God without separation. And in the third Enunciation, he affirms, That the Word was, *(i. e. ver. 1. Et essentialiter Deus) Παρὶ, ὁμοῦς τὸς*, essentially God, the same in Essence with the Father; and if the Article had been added, and it had been *ὁ Θεός*, it had affirmed the Son to be the same Person with the Father. It's no small matter, therefore, in the declaring this divine Mystery, that the Article is first added, and then afterwards omitted, to shew Christ is God, tho' not God the Father. See what an Argument yours is, because the Socinians will make a false Inference from the leaving out of *6, Job. 1. 1.* Therefore it must be Socinianism to argue from *Rom. 3. 20.* because the Prepositive is left out, and Law used indefinitely, that all Laws are understood, and Justification by all Law-Works are excluded. And whereas, you say, the Text speaks directly of the Law of *Moses*; if you mean thereby the moral-Law, it was essentially the same with the Law of Innocency; and the denial of Justification by one, is also a denial of Justification by the other; and so by all Doctrins, requiring duty, as Mr. *Beza* saith. What you say of *Gal. 3. 11.* militates against your self, whereas you say, *Was every Law given 430 years after Abraham? Is not the Apostle express, in the 3 first Chapters, that that Law was the Jewish Law?* [Do you not mean Moral and Ceremonial, and Judicial? For of these parts were the Jewish Law] or as most the Law of Nature together with it.

R. Were not these all Laws of Duty that God made, and all comprehended in the Law of Nature, requiring universal obedience to God in all things, that he should ever Command?

But observe that Justification by Christ, which is the same always in the Apostle's sense as Justification by Faith, is opposed to Justification by the Law of *Moses*, which was the way the Jews looked after, partly by Sacrifice, partly by their Obedience to that Law in the preceptive part; and thus they followed after that Law of Righteousness, *Rom. 9. 31.* and attained it not, because they sought it not by Faith, *sed. 6. quasi operibus Legis*, as it were by the Works of the Law, *v. 32.* Mr. *Beza*, refuting *Erasmus* on that place, saith, "*Erasmus* wrongs the Jews, in that he thinks that they lookt upon the Salvation they had, to have been by Works only, the Grace of God excluded; for the contrary to this Assertion appears by the Prayer of the Pharisee, that the Jews had no other Opinion of Merits and Grace, than now our Sophists have, which conjoyn Free-will with Grace, and Faith with Works. And indeed this was the stumbling-block. I might go through *Paul's* Epistles to evince this, That all sorts of Works are opposed to Grace in Justification, *quasi e regione perpetuo adversantur.*"

And

And this is the Point he deals so roundly with the *Galatians* about, viz. Their Judaizing; in joyning Works with Faith in Justification; not so much the Ceremony of Circumcision, which at another time he admitted of, but because of the reason why now the *Galatians* thought Circumcision so necessary, viz. as a Work of the Law; therefore he testified, That if they were circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing; and thereby they were obliged to keep the whole Law for Justification; because obeying it in one point would not serve, they could not be justified partly by Christ, and partly by some partial obedience to the Law; and there was as much reason to plead for a *Mosaic* imperfect obedience, to joyn with the Sacrifices in Justification, before Christ, as there is now for an Evangelical imperfect obedience to conjoyn with Christ's Righteousness now, and more.

Lastly, Grace and Free-gifts is by all Men opposed to all conditional claim, upon performance of a Duty required by any Law; and the Apostle always makes this Debt, *Rom. 4. 4.* Let the conditional part be never so small, it's a Debt *ex pacto*. Hence the Apostle placeth both eternal Life and the Righteousness by which we are justified, all in free Gift to us, *Rom. 5. 15, 16, 22.* Yea he directly opposeth the Gospel gift of eternal life (which comprehends Grace and Glory) to any Law with Sanction, viz. last, i. e. any Law that pays Death as the Wages of Sin: *The Wages of Sin is Death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ*, &c. Now if your new Law makes Death the Wages of any Sin, then the Gospel gift of eternal Life is opposed to it.

You say, p. 25. "The Benefits are not given us for our Faith, but upon believing."

R. For and Upon, in a Covenant sense, are the the same; to convey an Estate upon the payment of 5 Shillings is a Bargain, and good *ex pacto*, tho' the Estate be worth hundreds. You say, "If a Man says, I will give you a thousand Pound, provided you will come and fetch it; is it not free Gift? I suppose its reckoned so by him that is able and willing to fetch it. But the Case may be so, that if some Men offer me a thousand Pound, I will not fetch it to have it, and then I may not be able. One may offer a thousand Pound to a Man that lies with broken Arms and Legs in the bottom of a deep Well, provided he will come and fetch it, especially when he knows no Body can set his Limbs and help him out. And how oft do you say, the first Grace is absolute? And to say the same thing is absolute in the power of another, and make it a condition by Law with Sanction unto me, is the greatest absurdity in the World. And I tell you, that if a rich Man offers a hundred Pound to a poor Man, lame and Blind, and in Prison, and the King makes a Law he should come and fetch it, or else be hang'd, it would cease to be a Free-gift."

Arg. 2. *That which is a Law with Sanction curseth every one under that Law, with an ir-retrievable Curse upon the first Transgression of the said Law; but the Gospel doth not bind any one under a Curse ir-retrievable, by the Gospel, upon the first Sin, or many Sins committed against the Grace of it; therefore the Gospel is not a Law with Sanction.*

The Major is very manifest, That there's no Law pardons a Transgression of itself: It is a universal Maxim concerning not only the Law of Creation, but of all Laws, *Gal. 3. 10.* from *Deut. 27. 26.* the Apostle saith, *He that is under Law is under a Curse, provided he doth not all things that are written in the Book of the said Law that he is under:* therefore first he saith, *ἐξ ἡρῶν νόμου.* in the second place, *ἐν βίβλῳ τῶ νόμου.* Suppose you speak of your New Law, the Condition whereof you make Faith and sincere Obedience; lowered Conditions and imperfect Obedience: And these are the *all things* contained in the Book of this Law; then immediately upon the Publishing and Promulgation thereof all Unbelievers are ir-retrievably condemned by that Law. The Wages due by that Law to every Unbeliever, upon his first unbelief, is Death: And the said Law cannot relieve him, because he hath not done whatever was writ in the Book of this Law: it's true one Law may relieve us in respect of another, in some sense at least as to the Curse of it, but no Law relieves from its own Curse, therefore if the new

Law

Law curseth Unbelief, it curseth the Unbeliever irretrievably, upon the first Act of Sin in that kind.

The Minor is plain, because the Gospel doth relieve from the Curse that lies upon Men for Unbelief (being in its proper Nature a Transgression of, and Disobedience to the first Law) there's no Sin or Curse but the Gospel gives Relief, though aggravated by the rejection of a Remedy; all Laws, with Sanction, give the due Recompence (constituted by that Law) to the Transgressor of it in any one Point, therefore sin is always, in respect of that Law against which it is, unpardonable, for therein the nature of that Sin is adjusted, and the Punishment that is made due to it. Hence therefore if the Gospel be a Law with Sanction, every one that appears upon Tryal to have transgressed it after its Promulgation, less or more is under the Curse of it, and that Person which any Law hath once cursed, it can never bless; therefore this Position puts thousands under a most certain, hopeless and helpless Condition by the Gospel.

Arg. 3. That which is a Law with Sanction, if it contain a Promise of Benefits upon Obedience, is a Covenant of Works; for upon the same Grounds that the Punishment is the Wages due in case of disobedience: Upon the same is the Benefit due, in case of Obedience; the same Law makes one a Debt as well as the other, for whatever is of Law is of Debt, either upon the account of Sin or of Righteousness; the Law was the same upon both accounts to Adam, Life had been a Reward, and Wages due as well as Death: Therefore the Apostle argues so strenuously against all kind of Works, *Rom. 4. 4.* *τὸ ἐργαζομεθα ὁ μισθός*, to him that worketh there's a Reward; not *κτ' χάριν ἀλλ' κτ' πρὸς ὀφείλημα*, not of Grace but of Debt; and he excepteth not him that worketh according to the new, but to him that worketh, whether according to the Old or New Law; the Reward to him that worketh by any Law, is Debt by the said Law.

Arg. 4. If the Gospel be a Law, its either the same Law with the Law of Nature, or a distinct Law from it: But its neither the same Law nor a distinct Law from it, therefore no Law with Sanction. The Necessity of the Consequence in the disjunction cannot be doubted by any Man of Reason.

The Minor is thus demonstrated. 1. Its not the same Law with the Law of Nature; this you will not say, because you call it a New Law: And if it be the same Law, then you have no Pretence to evade all the Consequences that will be drawn upon you from the Doctrine and Arguments of the Apostle Paul; therefore I doubt not but I am secure of you as to this part of the Dilemma.

Therefore I come to the second, That which must be essentially the same Law with the Old Law, is not a distinct Law from it, but your New Law must be essentially the same with the Old Law, therefore is not distinct from it.

Your new Law can have no Essentials distinct from the Old Law, for if it have the same Essentials its the same, the same Matter and Form, and the same integral Parts wherein they consist. The parts of a Law are Condition and Promise, in case of Obedience, and Threat in case of Disobedience, the connexion of these makes the Form; all this you'll allow. Hence there's the same Law-Nature in one as in the other, and therefore its a Law in the same way and manner, and a Man under it must be dealt with in a Law way and manner: Obedience to God was commanded there, and so here; Disobedience to God forbidden there, and so here; Life promised there upon Obedience, and Death threatened there upon Disobedience, and so here: And what Obedience is there which is not commanded in the Old Law? And what Disobedience that is not forbidden there? But you will say the Old Law commanded perfect Obedience, and the new imperfect. A. The New Law would not certainly command what the Old Law forbade; but the Old Law forbade all Imperfection in Obedience, and cursed it. 2. Whatever the degree of Obedience is that any Law requires, its perfect, in regard of that Law that requires it. 3. It should be strange if God should make that which is imperfect, sinful, condemned Obedience by one Law, to be perfect Obedience, and justifying by

a New, and so set Law against Law. Lastly, as to the Promise, its the same, for it was everlasting Life, both in the old Covenant and the new; the manner of having it by Works or by Grace, alters not the nature of the thing itself. A House in itself is the same whether I purchase it or it be given. From all which I conclude, This pretended New Law is no other than the Old Law furnished up again, that in itself it must be essentially the same, the Works and Justification by them, that if there be some little difference in modalities it makes no essential Change, than is in a Man that wears one coloured Suit of Cloaths one day, and another on another Day. I argue, That Covenant that bestows the Grace of the Promise without a previous Condition, is not a new Law; but the Covenant of Grace bestows the Grace of it without previous Conditions performed by us. Therefore it bestows eternal Life unconditionally; *ergo*, for it bestows the first Grace (according to yours) unconditionally, which is Eternal Life, Feb. 17. 3.

Arg. 5. If there be no need of a New Law, God is so wise he will not make a New Law, if there be no need of it or use for it, then the Gospel is no New Law: But there's no need or use of a New Law.

Minor, There's no need or use for it, neither in respect of Law or Gospel Dispensation of Justice or of Grace. 1. There is no need or use in respect of Law or Justice, because the old Law is a sufficient Rule for distributive and commutative Justice, it condemns every Transgression and Disobedience eternally, it hath provided Curse and Condemnation enough for the greatest and most aggravated Sin, for unbelief in the least and highest degree; and so for Impenitency: All the World is guilty by this Law, God rules the World by it, and will judge it by it, there's not the least or greatest Duty but is here commanded, which is or shall be the Will of God, not only in way of moral Duty, but in all Matters of instituted Worship under the Old and New Testament. Lastly, in respect of Justification and Reward, if God had intended to have given Life as a Reward of the Works of any Law, he could as easily have done it by the Old Law, and sure would never have made a new one to have done it by. 2. There is no need of a new Law in regard of the Dispensation of the Grace of the Gospel: Because what the Gospel doth its in way of delivery of Man from the Curse of the Law that they lye already under; and here there is no need of Law, because its done all in a way of free Grace, Pardon of a condemned Prisoner must come merely from the good will of the Prince, its inconsistent with his Prerogative to be bound to it by a Law; therefore God reserves this Prerogative, he will have Mercy on whom he will have Mercy. And its needless in respect of the condemned person, because there's need of nothing but a free Offer of Grace and Mercy to a condemned Prisoner, if he refuses it its at his own peril, its his choosing; but to remain in *statu quo*, under the Law, that he was condemned by, and to be executed according to it. You'll say, there's need of a new Law in respect of new Obedience. A. I say no; for God's Law is still perfect in respect of the Rule of Obedience. 2. The Gospel requires no other Obedience materially than what the Law required. 3. The Gospel makes provision in the dispensation of free Grace for all Obedience the Law requires, for the perfection of it in Christ, for our Conformity to it through its Promise, teaching and new creating, and writing that Law anew in our Hearts which the Fall had blotted out. Well, to conclude this Argument, the Apostle expressly saith, *Rom. 3. 21. Now without Law, $\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma$ νόμου, the righteousness of God is made manifest, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, i. e. by the whole Old Testament, as the Jews were wont to divide it; and therefore saith $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha$ νόμου, &c. for Distinction from Law, in the Sense that he took it in, when he saith, without Law: new Obedience is obedience to the Law, from a new Life, Principles, Strength, and for new Ends.*

Arg. 6. That which is inconsistent with the Grace of God in the Gospel, is not to be admitted; but that the Gospel should be a Law with sanction, is inconsistent with the Grace of God in the Gospel. *Ergo*, The Minor is easily made manifest, 1. From

the Nature of a Law, that's to enforce's Obedience ; where a thing is freely given, its expected it should be freely received and not enforced. 2. Its inconsistent with shewing Mercy to poor, lame, blind Cripples, to offer them Relief upon unperformable Conditions. Yea, its also an abuse of Justice to make a Law, That lame Men should walk before their Limbs be restored : I pray did Christ heal the Diseased, restore the Lunaticks, raise the Dead, cast out Devils, by a Law ? 3. If it be consistent with the Grace of the Gospel to act by a Law in saving Sinners, it must be before Regeneration or after ; not before, for then they will come under no Law; they are out in Rebellion against all Law, nay they are already in the Custody of the Law, and therefore not capable of coming under the Terms of another. 2. Their Salvation must lye in Delivery of them from the Custody and Curse of that they are under ; which cannot be by making Terms with them, but with the Law offended that detains them ; therefore it must be mere Grace without a Law, that must open the Prison Doors to them. 3. You say the first Grace is absolutely and freely given, therefore the Sinner can come under no terms of Law in order to the bringing him into a state of Grace, for terms of a Law laid upon any suppoeth a Power and Ability in them to perform the said terms, if they will, and that they can both will and do if they will. It is not a new Law after Regeneracy, for then Grace begun would cease to be free Grace afterward : Christ is not only the Author, but the Finisher of our Faith and Obedience, our perseverance and standing in Grace would not be so secure as its beginning, the Grace of the Covenant would not be homogeneous, one part would be free and absolute, the other conditional and upon Terms ; but the Operation of the Spirit and Promises of after-grace, they are all of the same nature from first to last, as God begins so he perfects and compleats the new Man ; he works all our Works in us, all-a-long, in the same way and manner as they are begun.

Arg. 7. If the Gospel be a new Law, it was made as soon as the old Law was broken : And, as new as it is, it must be that Law by which the Patriarchs antediluvian and postdiluvians were saved. This consequence, I suppose, cannot be denied, because we are saved even as they, and the Gospel was preached unto them. But there was no such new Law from Adam to Paul's time : 1. The Gospel was not delivered to our first Parents in the terms of a Law, but absolutely so to Abraham. The Apostle is most expresse in it, That there was no Law given to his time, that could be a Gospel, i. e. that could give Life to Sinners, Gal. 3. 21. *If there had a Law been given which could have given life, verily Righteousness had been by a Law :* And now I pray except not at my reading *vôu* a Law, indefinitely understanding any Law, for our Translators render it so ; and I must tell you they should by the same reason have rendered *ix vôu* in the same manner, and then the Text had been uniform in the Translation as in the Original, *if there had been a Law (any Law) given, which could have given Life, verily Righteousness had been by a Law :* Therefore your new Law was not given before Paul's Time, but the Gospel was, therefore the Gospel is no Law with Sanction.

Luther on this place saith thus. " Though those Words of Paul be never so plain, yet the Papists have this wicked Gloss always ready, That he speaketh only of the Ceremonial Law : But Paul speaketh plainly, and excepteth no Law, whether Moral or Ceremonial, or any other : Wherefore their Gloss is not worth a Rush. And contrariwise we affirm, That there is no Law, whether Man's Law or God's Law that giveth Life ; therefore we put as great a difference between the Law and Righteousness as between Life and Death, between Heaven and Hell ; and the Cause that moveth us so to affirm, is, That the Apostle saith, The Law is not given to justify, to give Life and to save, but only to kill and to destroy, contrary to the Opinion of all Men naturally, &c. This Difference of the Offices of the Law and the Gospel keepeth all Christian Doctrin in its true and proper use.

This Witness of *Luther* I can set against all the Testimonies you bring from any whatever, who hold or have held the Gospel a Law with Sanction, as you do; divers may speak of it under the term of a Law of Faith, or understanding by Law the Precepts of the Gospel; but if they plead, that the true and proper nature of the Gospel is a Law with Sanction, as you do, I do renounce their Opinion, and do oppose them therein, as I do you, it being as such fundamentally destructive to the Gospel, and the whole nature of the Grace of it.

And on *Gal. 4. 4.* — “Christ being made under the Law, is not a Law-giver, or a Judge after the Law, but in that he made himself subject to the Law, he delivered us from the Curse thereof. Now whereas Christ under the Gospel giveth Commandments, and teacheth the Law, or expoundeth it rather, this pertaineth not to the Doctrine of Justification, but of good Works. Moreover, It is not the proper Office of Christ (for which he came into the World) to teach the Law, but accidental, as it was to heal the weak, &c. — Wherefore the true proper Office of Christ is to wrestle with the Law, — to conquer and abolish Sin and Death, — to deliver the faithful from the Law and all Evils — Let us learn to put a difference between Christ and a Law-giver, — that when the Devil goes about to trouble us under his Name, we may know him to be a very Fiend. — Christ is no *Moses*, he is nothing else but Infinite Mercy, freely giving. On *Gal. 2. 20.* Now as it is the greatest knowledge and cunning that Christians have thus to define Christ, so of all things it is hardest. I my self in this great light of the Gospel, wherein I have been so long exercised, to hold the distinction of Christ which *Paul* giveth so deeply, hath the Doctrine and pestilent Opinion, that Christ is a Law-giver, entred into my Bones. You young Men therefore are in a far happier condition, for you are not infected with those pernicious Errors wherein I have been so muzzled and drowned from my youth, that at my hearing the Name of Christ, my Heart hath trembled and quaked for fear, for I was perswaded, that he was a severe Judge; wherefore it is to me a double trouble to correct and reform this Evil: 1. To forget, condemn and resist this old-grounded Error, That Christ is a Law-giver and a Judge. 2. To plant in my Heart a new and true perswasion of Christ, that he is a Justifier and a Saviour. Ye that are young may learn with much less difficulty to know Christ purely and sincerely, if you will.

Arg. 8. If the Gospel be a new Law, then we must have a double Righteousness for our justification; but we have not a double Righteousness for our justification, therefore the consequence is good, 1. From most of your Concessions, that we have the righteousness of Christ, and that which you call subordinate. [You should rather have said as *Dr. Owen* argues, that Christ's righteousness is the subordinate, it being *in ordine ad*, in order to our justification by a new Law.] *Mr. B.* and others speak more distinctly and say, a legal and evangelical righteousness; but, in truth, it must be two legal righteousnesses: For, 2. There's no Law but must have a peculiar distinct righteousness from that of any other Law, whereby a Man under it must be justified, and all the righteousness that serves for justification by another Law, hath nothing to do in our justification by the said Law; and therefore there must be two distinct Righteousnesses and two distinct Justifications, as there are two distinct Laws. Unless you say the old Law is vacated, which is a contradiction; if you do but own, that Christ is the end of that Law for righteousness to every one that believed, and then it cannot be vacated, for a Law vacated and a Law in force is a contradiction, and a Law fulfilled to every jot and tittle to every believer remains in force. Therefore it remains, that we have two righteousnesses for justification, and both legal, because all Law-righteousness is legal; Christ's single righteousness is indeed legal in respect of the Law, and evangelical in respect of sinners, it being to them the gift of righteousness; so with us the same thing differs only respectively. 3. There must be as distinct righteousnesses

for justification, as there is unrighteousness for condemnation ; but each Law hath its distinct unrighteousness for condemnation.

The Minor is easily proved, that we have not two righteousnesses for justification, for if we have, 1. Christ's righteousness is not enough for our justification unto life, contrary to the Scripture. 2. All the Popish Doctrine will unavoidably come in at this gate, which is wide enough for it. 3. Our own Works, call them what you will, let them be Faith and sincere Obedience, imperfect Holiness, &c. must come in for a share in our justification, contrary to *Tit.* 3. 4, 5. and an hundred places of Scripture besides, nay, for the whole of our justification by the new Law ; for the righteousness that answers that, must be distinct from the righteousness that answers the old Law ; to enervate this Doctrine, many have wrote to very good purpose, in particular that most worthy Divine, Mr. *Traugton* in his *Lutherum redivivum*, a Book worth every Christian's having.

You say, p. 25. *Hath the Gospel-Covenant no Sanction ? what think you of Heb. 8. 6 ?*

R. You might have said *Heb.* 9. 15, 16. I said not, that the Gospel-Covenant hath no Sanction : it hath a Sanction, as a Testament in the Death of Christ, in which the Law is satisfied for us, and upon which the better, absolute and clear Promises are founded ; and herein was that *νομοθεσια* placed, the establishment of the Promises of Life and Salvation, on the sure Conditions of Christ's Righteousness, and not of our Performances.

You say, *What will become of Dr. Owen's Law of Justification*, p. 167.

R. His Law of Justification is the Law that Christ came under, in doing and suffering, the fulfilling God's Will for the justification of a sinner ; this was the Law that was in his heart ; for the Doctor's words are, Not that he did as a King constitute the Law of Justification, (as you say) for it was given and established in the first Promise, and he came to put it in execution.

You say, *It's one thing to be justified for Faith, and another to be justified by it.*

R. I say so too, if it be in the Apostle's sense, by Faith be in opposition to by Works ; but if you make Faith a Law-condition, then this by becomes for, and it signifies just as much as being justified by Works. And thus Mr. Bulky in your own Quotation is against you, for he saith, *If we make the Commandment of Believing to be legal, then the Promise of Life, upon the Condition of Believing, must be legal also.* And so it must needs be upon your Hypothesis, that the Gospel is a Law. You often say, the Gospel-Law is not a Law of Works, and that Paul saith so, p. 26. What is so said either by the Apostle or you, the Gospel is denied thereby to be a Law with Sanction or Law-Covenant, for if there be no Works as Condition of it, there's nothing but Promise ; but where is your sincere, conditional, imperfect Obedience, if there be no Works ? It's absurd to say the first Grace is a Condition required of us, because you grant it absolute.

You tell us what Dr. O. saith on *Pf.* 130 p. 230. *This is the inviolable Law of the Gospel ; i.e. believing and forgiveness are inseparably conjoined, which hath nothing of your sense in it.* Concerning Faith's being the Condition of a Law with Sanction, he saith nothing ; he means no more but that they are connexed by God's constitution. So there are many things connexed in the Promise, as Faith and Forgiveness, Faith and Repentance, Faith and Love, Justification and Sanctification and Glorification. I could quote you a hundred places out of Dr. O. where he militates against this very Principle of yours : See Dr. O. of Justific. p. 407. " The Apostle speaks not one word of the Exclusion of the Merit of Works, only he excludes all Works whatsoever. — Some think they are injuriously dealt withal, when they are charged with maintaining Merit — Yet those that best understand themselves and the Controversie, are not so averse to any kind of merits, knowing that it's inseparable from Works. — Those among us who plead for Works in our Justification, as they use many distinctions to explain their minds and free themselves from a co-incidence with that of the Papists, they deny the name of
" Merit

" Merit in the sense of the Church of *Rome*, and so do the Socinians. See more, p. 408, 409. where he shews all Works before and after Grace are excluded.

What you quote out of my honoured Father's Book, I see nothing contradicts me, if rightly understood ; had not your Doctrin been contrary to his, (tho' I hope I should defend the truth, according to my light and conscience, tho' against my own Father) I should never have given you the least opposition ; but it's not Human Authority must turn the Scales in these Matters. You quote Mens transient Expressions that speak of a Gospel-law and Conditions in a sense that may be born with, when they approve themselves clear in all main Points : others speaking in such a Dialect in Sermons and Practical Discourses ; To shew that such things as God hath conjoyned, Man is not to sever. As for the two great Divines, besides D. O. I mean Dr. *Goodwin* and Mr. *Clarkson*, I know them to be exprelly against your Notion of the conditionality of the Covenant, and by what you quote out of them, it appears to be so. See Dr. *Goodwin's* Judgment about Condition, Whether Faith be a Condition, Sermon XXII. p. 301. " I would have " this word laid aside, I see both Parties speak faintly on't ; *Perkins* on the *Galatians*, " and another. — There is danger in the use of it, a Condition may be pleaded. 2. In " those Expressions, if a Man believeth he shall be saved, import, that he that doth " so, shall be saved in the event, which the Elect only are, to whom he giveth Faith. " — My Beloved, the nature of Faith is modest, it never maketh plea for it self ; if " it were a Condition, a Man might plead it before God ; and the making it a Con- " dition, seems to me, to import as if there were an universal Grace ; and that it is " the Condition terminateth it to this Man and not to that. What Mr. *Clarkson* saith, is " nothing to your purpose : for he saith, The first Blessings of the Covenant are promi- " sed absolutely, and subsequent Blessings, are in some sense Conditional. — Not that " God makes a conditional Bargain with us, but because divine Wisdom hath made " a connexion between these Blessings that they shall never be separated, &c.

*Lastly, I shall give an Account of the beginning and progress of
this Neonomian Error.*

This Doctrin was first forged by the Pharisees of old, who did not believe themselves justified by perfect Obedience to the moral Law, their owning the Sacrifices and other Types (their Gospel) being a sufficient evidence that they acknowledged themselves great Sinners, and far enough from perfect Obedience ; they only thought that Obedience that they did perform, was through the merciful Nature of God accepted to Justification of Life, and their Sins expiated by Sacrifices.

For not only the Scriptures give us full assurance of this to be truth, but it were easy to shew what the Opinion of the ancient and latter Jews were, in this Matter. 1. They placed their Righteousness, not in perfect Obedience, but in sincere. So *Paul*, before his Conversion, *Act.* 26. 5. 9. Chap. 23. 1. *Rom.* 10. 9. The Jews went to establish their own Righteousness and their imperfect Obedience, as such, in conjunction with the attoning Sacrifices for their Justification. And *R. Menabem* saith, *Scito vitam Hominis in praeceptis* ; Know that the Life of Man, in the Precepts, is according to the intention that he hath in doing them : But, they say, Faith is the cause of Blessedness, and, therefore, the cause of eternal Life. Thus the Author of *Sepher Ikkarim*. And that Faith justifies as Righteousness itself ; for, saith the same Author, Our Father *Abraham* was praised, by reason of his Faith ; for it's said, *Gen.* 15. *He believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness*. And that this Doctrin was that which *Paul* contendeth with the judaizing Christians about, and the false Teachers among them, I doubt not in the least, and am very apt to believe, that it was these Neonomians that laid that Charge upon *Paul's* Doctrin ; that it was a Doctrin of Licentiousness, and
made

made so great a Cry against it, for Antinomianism; or as being destructive to the Righteousness of the Law and Obedience thereunto.

Philip, a Presbyter and Hearer of *Hierom*, on *Job* 42. tells of a Heretick, then living, that held this Opinion, That the Gospel was a Law, *Christop. Pelag.* The next I find it charged upon, is *Pelagius*, as one of his grand Heresies. And from the Pelagians, saith Dr. *Leydecker*, the Papists have taken up this Principle. The Council of Trent, *Anath.* 20. "Curse all that say the Gospel is a Promise without condition of observing the Commandments. And *Anath.* 21. They Curse those that say, Christ is given for a Redeemer, and not a Law-maker. And *Anath.* 26. They Curse them that say, The just ought not to expect a Reward for their Works. Peter a Soto tells us, the Catholic Church doth hold, That Christ gave a new Law. The same saith *S. De Clara*. It is generally held by all the Jesuits. *Belarmin* in his Controv. de Justif. contends, That the Gospel, as such, is a Law; and that it contains proper Laws, with Threats and Promises, and requires Obedience as the Condition of Life, and of the accomplishments of Promises, which are so conditioned; and that Merits cannot be otherwise defended, which the Papacy holds. *Gregory de Valentia* tells us, They reject the usual distinction of Law and Gospel, viz. That the Law Promises are conditional, the Gospel Promises free and absolute. *Tom. 2. Controv. Disput. 7. Q. 6.* He calls it a Fiction. *Mr. Fox*, in *Ast. & Mon. Impr.* 7. p. 34. vol. 1. gives this following Account of the Papist's Opinion in this Point, They say, Moses was a giver of the old Law, Christ of the new. Thus, imagine they, the Gospel to be nothing else but a new Law, given by Christ, binding to the Promises the Conditions of our doings and deservings, no otherwise than to the old Law; and so divide they the whole Law into three parts, the Law of Nature, the Law of Moses, and the Law of Christ, to the fulfilling whereof they attribute Justification. And thus they lead the Consciences of Men in doubt, and induce many Errors, bringing the People into a false opinion of Christ, as tho' he were not a Remedy against the Law, but came as another Moses to give a new Law to the World.

Dr. Barnes, who suffered Martyrdom in *Henry VIII.*'s time, *An. Dom.* 1541. vigorously opposed the Popish Bishops in this Point; as appears by his excellent Treatise of Justification.

In defending Justification, by Faith alone, according to the true meaning of the Apostle *Paul*, hath these Passages.

"It were but lost Labour for *Paul* to prove that Works did help to Justification; for that the Jews did grant, and required no more; but that which they stood upon, was, that Works might not be clearly excluded. But here, peradventure, it will be said, that *Paul* condemns the Works of the old Law, but not of the new Law; Are you now satisfied in your Consciences? Think you, that you have now assayed *Paul's* Argument? Think you to be thus discharged before God? Go boldly to the Judgment of God, with this Evasion, and doubt not but then you shall find *St. Paul* stiffly and strongly against you, and your new Works, as ever he was against the Jews and their old Works. Briefly, what Works can you excoitate to do, which be not in the old Law, and of the old Law? Therefore he speaks of all manner of Works; for the Law includeth all Works that ever God instituted, the highest, best and most of Perfection; what Works, in the new Law, have you better than those of the old Law? &c. — But grant that there be certain Works of the new Law which be not of the old; yet have you not, nor can prove that these shall justify; for there can be no more goodness in Works, than were in the Works of the old Law, for they were to God's Honour, and the Profit of the Neighbour, and yet you grant they cannot justify. *St. Paul* disputes against them that were Christened, and had Works of the old Law and of the new; yet concludes, that Christ alone justified. Mark his Argument; If Righteousness cometh by the Law, then is Christ dead in vain, &c. where he proceeds to enervate this Doctrine of Neomianism.

From the Papists the Socinians took up this Doctrine, as *Dr. Leidecker* shews, styling them, Our new Pelagians. They do indeed (saith he) exclude Ceremonial Works, and

and Works of the Jews, who oppose the Gospel, but when they may seem to differ

Socin. faith, *Paul* treats concerning perfect Works of that Law, and seeing none can be justified by them, the Law requiring perfect Obedience; therefore the Apostle saith, *We are justified by faith and obedience, so far as a man is able to perform them.*

c. 13. This *Dr. Barrow*, the Arminians, when they began to spring up, highly applauded, saith *Dr. Leidaker*; His Words are, *Similes habent labra lactucas*; He says, they changed the very Decalogue into a Covenant of Grace, confounding it with the Gospel, asserting a Covenant of Works; saying, That notwithstanding the giving Christ, God might have set up again a Covenant of Works, but he would not, because of the weakness of the Flesh: Therefore in the room of the rigid Covenant of Works he substituted a milder Covenant, mixed with goodness and grace, in which Faith with imperfect Obedience to the Law might be accepted for perfect Righteousness unto Life. These Doctrins Arminians began to vent, but *Episcopius* taught them openly, whom *Curcellius* also followed as his Master, and more lately *Dr. Limburgius*; who asserts, That the Scripture no where teacheth Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us; and saith, This Error, so he calls the Doctrine of the imputation of Christ's Righteousness) ariseth from a false Opinion, That Christ gave full satisfaction to vindictive Justice for all the Sins of the Elect, and bore their Punishment in their stead, and fulfilled the Law for them: That the Gospel contains no Precepts, but in respect of the Elect are meer Promises, &c. Which Doctrine of *Limburgius* are, (saith the said learned Author) *santum non Sociniana*: He sheweth how this Man excludes all Works from Justification, but only the Works of the new Law. He shews how the Remonstrants, the Dutch Arminians took up with this Doctrine; how it prevailed in France, which after the endeavours of *Melissierus* and *Corducius*, *Cambré's triplex fœdus*, gave the greatest occasion to, which *Cocceius* and his followers opposed: And lastly shews how it hath prevailed in England, in opposition to which the Labours of *Dr. Owen*, in his Treatise of Justification, and of *Mr. Troughton*, in his *Lutherus redivivus*, is highly commended by him.

From all which it doth appear, That this is no new Error, but an old one; even since Christ's and the Apostles times, and hath been a leading Principle to all Doctrins, contrary to the free Justification of a Sinner by the Righteousness of Christ alone, apprehended by Faith: And the foundation of the Doctrine of Free-will, and the natural Power and Ability of fallen Man, to do good Works that are pleasing unto God, and in some way or other, in part or in whole, rewardable.

He that will see a full account of this Doctrine, from the Positions of the Jesuits, and a clear Refutation thereof, and all their Arguments they bring for it, even more than you do, let him read, the learned *Dr. Christopher Pelargus*, loco Xii. de Evangelio, in his *Jesuitismus*, printed Ann. D. m. 1608.

Divers Passages in your Reply and its Preface, wherein you lie open, I have omitted remarking upon: 1. For brevity sake. 2. Such as concern others, I leave to them. 3. As to all material Points, in difference, you'll see my mind elsewhere. I shall only note, how weak and absurd the Reason is, you give for your desiring the Testimony of so many to your Book, viz. *Because the People do often value Names more than Arguments.*

Q. D.

Q. D. The People must be lead by an Implicit Faith, as in days past; *Populus vult decipi, ergo decipitur.* Can Protestants think this Reason is for their Honour and Safety? But I spare you; and do assure you, my Design hath not been for Contention, in contending for what I have thought to be the Truth; but my cordial Desire is, that all may issue in the Unity of the Spirit of Truth and Peace, and what collateral Expressions have fallen from my Pen, from first to last, that are justly discredited by you, or any other that feareth the Lord; ascribe it to human Frailty, which I am lyable to; and usually may be seen in Contests of this Nature, how just soever they be. Excuse my plainness of Speech throughout, and allow something to every Man's natural Temper and Disposition. Sir, I am willing to be, notwithstanding all that hath passed,

Your faithful Friend and Brother in the Lord, J. C.

BOOKS Printed for Henry Barnard, at the Sign of the Bible in the Poultry.

Examen Confessionis Pacifica: Or, a friendly Examination of the Pacifick Paper; chiefly concerning the consistency of Absolute Election of particular Persons with the Universality of Redemption, and the Conditionality of the Covenant of Grace: Wherein also the New Scheme is clearly declared. By *Isaac Chancy, M. A.*

The old Man's Legacy to his Daughters: Wherein the hidden Mysteries of Faith and Experience are briefly discussed and laid down, in a plain and familiar Dialogue; in six several Conferences betwix the Author's two Daughters, *Elizabeth and Margaret.* To which is added, Some Choice Discoveries of the Author's most excellent Experiences; in two Parts. Written by *N. T.* deceased, when near Ninety Years of Age, for the private Use of his Daughters aforesaid; and now made publick, at the request of many, by an Admirer of Grace and Truth.

The Banquetting-house, or, a Feast of Fat Things: A Divine Poem, opening many Sacred Scripture Mysteries, profitable for all who would attain to the Saving Knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ. Written by *Benjamin Keach,* Author of *War with the Devil.*

Chirurgus Marinus: Or, the Sea-Chirurgion; being Instructions to Junior Chirurgick Practitioners, who design to serve at Sea in this Employ. In two general Parts: The first Part contains necessary Directions, how the Chirurgion should furnish himself with Medicines, Instruments and Necessaries fit for that Office; together with a Medicinal Catalogue, and an exemplary Invoice. The second Part contains the Chirurgions Practice at Sea, both Chirurgical and Physical; which practical Part serves as well at Land as at Sea. By *John Moyle, Sen.*

The third and last part of Neonomianism Unmask'd, in answer to *Mr. Dan. Williams's* first Book: Is now in the Press, and in a few Days will be published.